DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 102 067 SO 008 107

AUTHOR	Haigh, Anthony
TITLE	Cultural Diplomacy in Europe.
INSTITUTION	Council for Cultural Cooperation, Strasbourg (France).
PUB DATE	74
NOTE	223p.
AVAILABLE FROM	Manhattan Publishing Co., 225 Lafayette Street, New York, New York 10012 ($9.50)
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.76 HC Not Available from EDRS. PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS	*Cultural Exchange; Cultural Interrelationships; *Diplomatic History; European History; Exchange Programs; Foreign Countries; Foreign Policy; *Foreign Relations; *Intercultural Programs; *International Education; Political Science
IDENTIFIERS	*Europe; France; Germany; Italy; United Kingdom

ABSTRACT

The evolution of European government activities in the sphere of international cultural relations is examined. Section 1 describes the period between World War I and World War II when European governments tried to enhance their prestige and policies by means of cultural propaganda. Section 2 analyzes the period during World War II when the cohabitation of several exiled governments in the United Kingdom led to the impetus and development of both bilateral and collective forms of cultural diplomacy. The third section deals with the cultural diplomacy of specific countries including France, Italy, the Federal German Republic, and the United Kingdom. French cultural diplomacy is presented at the model, and an attempt is made to show how the other three countries vary from that model. Section 4 examines the collective experiences of three groups of countries in the field of cultural diplomacy. Attention is first given to the largely homogeneous group of five Nordic countries, which evolved a practice of collective cultural diplomacy among themselves. By way of contrast, the seven countries of the Western European Union including Belgium, the Netherlands, the United Kingdom, France, Luxembourg, the Federal German Republic, and Italy exhibit a system of collective cultural cooperation worked out to implement a clause of a treaty after World War II. The third group whose collective experience is examined is the 21 member Council for Cultural Co-operation and its Conference of European Ministers of Education established in 1961. (Author/DE)

ED102067

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS COPYRIGHTED MATERIAL BY MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Council of Europe
TO ERIC AND ORGANIZATIONS OPERATING UNDER AGREEMENTS WITH THE NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION. FURTHER REPRODUCTION OUTSIDE THE ERIC SYSTEM REQUIRES PERMISSION OF THE COPYRIGHT OWNER."

CULTURAL DIPLOMACY IN EUROPE

by

ANTHONY HAIGH

SO 008 107

COUNCIL OF EUROPE
STRASBOURG
1974

#9.50

The Council for Cultural Co-operation was set up by the Committee of Ministers of the Council of Europe on 1 January 1962 to draw up proposals for the cultural policy of the Council of Europe, to co-ordinate and give effect to the overall cultural programme of the organisation and to allocate the resources of the Cultural Fund. It is assisted by three permanent committees of senior officials: for higher education and research, for general and technical education and for out-of-school education. All the member governments of the Council of Europe, together with Greece, Finland, Spain and the Holy See are represented on these bodies.[1]

In educational matters, the aim of the Council for Cultural Co-operation (CCC) is to help to create conditions in which the right educational opportunities are available to young Europeans whatever their background or level of academic accomplishment, and to facilitate their adjustment to changing political and social conditions. This entails in particular a greater rationalisation of the complex educational process. Attention is paid to all influences bearing on the acquisition of knowledge, from home television to advanced research; from the organisation of youth centres to the improvement of teacher training. The countries concerned will thereby be able to benefit from the experience of their neighbours in the planning and reform of structures, curricula and methods in all branches of education.

---

[1] For complete list, see back cover.

By the same author (published by George G. Harrap, London):

A Ministry of Education for Europe

Congress of Vienna to Common Market: an outline of British foreign policy 1815-1972

CONTENTS

Page

Foreword 9

Bibliographical Note 15

Summary 19

Part I: Diplomacy finds a new technique 23

I Evolution of cultural diplomacy 25

II Response to a new challenge 39

Part II: National attitudes 63

III France 65

IV Italy 85

V Federal German Republic 99

VI United Kingdom 117

Part III: Collective experience 133

VII The Nordic Five 135

VIII The Brussels Treaty Five 155

IX The Seven of Western European Union 173

X Cultural mission of the Council of Europe 191

XI The Council for Cultural Co-operation 211

XII Europe twenty years ahead 231

Index 247

00605

FOREWORD

Shortly after its creation at the beginning of 1962, the Council for Cultural Co-operation of the Council of Europe decided to commission a series of studies intended to throw light upon a new and little-explored branch of international relations, namely cultural diplomacy in Europe.

The first study thus commissioned was to deal with "developments in the United Kingdom during the second world war, leading to the practice of collective cultural co-operation". The person invited to undertake this study was the British Council's representative in the Federal German Republic, Richard Seymour. He had joined the British Council early in 1940 and was soon afterwards appointed Deputy Secretary General. He acted as one of the secretaries of the Conference of Allied Ministers of Education which sat in London between 1942 and 1945. After the war he was for many years one of the British delegates to the Cultural Committee of the Brussels Treaty Organisation and to the Committee of Cultural Experts of the Council of Europe. After an introductory chapter which outlines the evolution of cultural diplomacy up to the outbreak of the second world war, Seymour's study, in a condensed version, provides the starting-point of this book, in the chapter headed "Response to a new challenge". This, and the introductory chapter, form Part I, to which I have given the description "Diplomacy finds a new technique". In the introductory chapter I have elaborated some ideas to which I originally gave expression in an article called "What is cultural diplomacy?" published in the *Unesco Handbook of International Exchanges*, 1965.

The next three studies to be commissioned dealt with cultural diplomacy as practised by the governments of three member states of the Council of Europe. Annie Angremy, whose study was entitled *La diplomatie culturelle de la France*, is a conservator in the department of manuscripts of the *Bibliothèque nationale* in Paris, with experience of preparing research papers. I have been compelled ruthlessly to compress her detailed and comprehensive description of French cultural diplomacy, but hope that I have been able to leave enough of it to show how the French, who were the pioneers of cultural diplomacy, must be regarded as the masters against whose policies and techniques the efforts of other nations still need to be measured.

Umberto Gori, whose study was devoted to *La Diplomazia Culturale Multilaterale Dell'Italia*, comes from the university world, and has contributed articles to sundry magazines on various aspects of international relations. From the chapter which I have based on his analysis of Italian action in this field it will, I hope, be evident that Italy has a special talent for cultural projection by means of the plastic arts, and a penchant for collective cultural diplomacy which finds a congenial outlet in the opportunities provided by Unesco.

Der Wiederaufbau der Auswärtigen Kulturbeziehungen durch die Bundesrepublik Deutschland nach dem Zweiten Weltkrieg is the title of Martinus Emge's study. Emge, who like Gori comes from the university world, worked for a period as cultural attaché in the German Embassy at Ottawa, and then in the Cultural Directorate of the *Auswärtiges Amt*. He has published a number of studies of German cultural diplomacy. In the chapter which I have derived from his exposition it will be seen that German cultural diplomacy has had to contend with the complications of a federal structure: this makes of the Federal Republic a potential small-scale model of the future pattern of collective cultural diplomacy among European countries.

In order to round out the picture presented in Part II, which I have named "National attitudes", it has been necessary for me to add a chapter on the United Kingdom. For ten years, from 1952 to 1962, I was head of the Cultural Relations Department of the Foreign Office in London, and as such in almost daily contact with the British Council, which acts as the principal agent of the United Kingdom Government in respect of that government's cultural diplomacy. The conduct of the essentials of a government's cultural diplomacy by an agency which enjoys a large measure of independence of that government makes the British experience exceptional. In compiling Part II of this book I have presented France as the model, and have tried to show how the cultural diplomacy of Italy, the Federal German Republic and the United Kingdom varies each in its own way from that model. It will I think be evident that the variations do no more than emphasise different aspects of a common theme.

To Part III, the final and longest part of this book, I have given the title "Collective experience". It is based on three further studies commissioned by the Council for Cultural Co-operation.

The first of these bears the title: *Twenty-five Years of Cultural Ventures — A Study in Nordic Cultural Co-operation 1946-72*. The person first invited to undertake this study was Leif Wilhelmsen, Chairman of the Norwegian Cultural Council, a member of the Council of Europe's Committee for Higher Education and Research and for six years chief editor of the Nordic periodical *Nordisk Forum*. After writing the introductory chapter, Wilhelmsen was unfortunately compelled for reasons of health to relinquish the task. The study was thereupon undertaken by Ingeborg Lyche, a member of the Nordic Cultural Commission from 1955 to 1971, of the Board of the Norwegian "Norden Association" since 1962 and of the Board of the Norwegian-Swedish Co-operation Funds since 1966.

It fell to me, as Director of Education and of Cultural and Scientific Affairs of the Council of Europe from 1962-68, to commission the foregoing five studies on behalf of the Council for Cultural Co-operation. When I retired, two studies remained to be commissioned, and my successor, Niels Borch-Jacobsen, kindly invited me to undertake them. One of these was named: *Western European Union: A Pioneer of Cultural Co-operation*, and the other: *Cultural Mission of the Council of Europe*. I had been a member of the Cultural Committee of the Brussels Treaty Organisation/Western European Union from 1952 until its transfer to the Council of Europe, of the Committee of Cultural Experts of the Council of Europe from 1952 until its absorption into the Council for Cultural Co-operation, and of the Administrative Board of the Cultural Fund during the three years of its existence.

Finally, Niels Borch-Jacobsen did me the honour of moving the Council for Cultural Co-operation to invite me to write the synthesis of the seven studies I have described, and so compile *Cultural Diplomacy in Europe*. In doing so, I have become more and more conscious of the amount of ground not covered in this book. At the time of writing (1972), twenty-one European governments have signed or acceded to the European Cultural Convention, and participate in the work of the Council for Cultural Co-operation of the Council of Europe and of the Conference of European Ministers of Education. The examination of national attitudes in Part II is however limited to the four largest countries whose governments have signed the European Cultural Convention. These four governments are the only ones which have made an attempt to enlighten the experts of other countries in their techniques, by each organising a course for the Cultural Committee of Western European Union in the 1950s; and by virtue of their greater resources these governments may be deemed to have explored the possibilities more thoroughly than their partners in the cultural community of Europe.

But creative imagination in the field of cultural diplomacy and skilful use of its techniques are by no means a monopoly, in Europe, of these four nations: and I am persuaded that much could be learned from a detailed study of the practice of the other seventeen governments engaged in the collective enterprise of the Council of Europe which is described in Part III. Then again, there are other collective enterprises which are left out of account: the experiments in certain aspects of multilateral cultural co-operation conducted in Europe by the North Atlantic Treaty Organisation; the work for European education carried out by the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development; and the European activities of the United Nations

Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation. *Cultural Diplomacy in Europe* must be regarded as indicative, not comprehensive.

My grateful thanks go, in the first place, to the Council for Cultural Co-operation, whom it was my privilege to serve during more than six years, for entrusting to me the great responsibility of writing this book; and in the second place to the authors of the studies (all but two of them unpublished) without which it could not have been compiled. Neither these authors, nor the Council for Cultural Co-operation, are responsible for the use which I have made of the material placed at my disposal: any opinions which I have expressed commit no one but myself.

Anthony Haigh
Crowhurst
September 1972

00011

BIBLIOGRAPHICAL NOTE

The following abbreviations are used in the notes:

Angremy *: *La diplomatie culturelle de la France*, by Annie Angremy (unpublished).

Barghoorn: *The Soviet Cultural Offensive: the Role of Cultural Diplomacy in Soviet Foreign Policy*, by Frederick C. Barghoorn; Princeton University Press, 1960.

Emge *: *Der Wiederaufbau der Auswärtigen Kulturbeziehungen durch die Bundesrepublik Deutschland nach dem Zweiten Weltkrieg*, by Martinus Emge (unpublished).

Gori *: *La Diplomazia Culturale Multilaterale Dell'Italia*, by Umberto Gori; Rome, Edizioni Bizarri, 1970.

Haigh (Council of Europe) *: *Cultural Mission of the Council of Europe*, by Anthony Haigh (published as a Council of Europe document).

Haigh (WEU) *: *Western European Union: A Pioneer of Cultural Co-operation*, by Anthony Haigh (unpublished).

Lyche *: *Twenty-five Years of Cultural Ventures: A Study in Nordic Cultural Co-operation 1946-72*, by Ingeborg Lyche (unpublished).

McMurry and Lee: *The Cultural Approach: Another Way in International Relations*, by Ruth Emily McMurry and Muna Lee; The University of North Carolina Press, 1947.

Seymour *: *Developments in the United Kingdom during the Second World War, leading to the Practice of Collective Cultural Co-operation*, by Richard Seymour (unpublished).

White: *The British Council, the first 25 years, 1934-59*, by A. J. S. White; The British Council, 1965.

---

* These studies, in English or French, are deposited with the Directorate of Education and of Cultural and Scientific Affairs, Council of Europe, Strasbourg (France).

SUMMARY

This consolidated study, based on seven pieces of original research commissioned by the Council for Cultural Co-operation, is designed to throw light upon a new branch of diplomacy which has hitherto received little attention from research students, and of which the public is only intermittently aware.

In the first part, entitled "Diplomacy finds a new technique", a preliminary chapter briefly summarises the evolution of cultural diplomacy, which is described as the activities of governments in the sphere — traditionally left to private enterprise — of international cultural relations. The period between the two world wars saw a number of governments attempting to enhance their prestige and support their policies by means of "cultural propaganda".

During the second world war, the co-habitation of several governments in exile in the United Kingdom provided an exceptional situation, which gave an impetus to the development of both bilateral and collective forms of cultural diplomacy. This situation is examined in the second chapter, "Response to a new challenge".

Part II is devoted to "National attitudes". The practice of cultural diplomacy by the Governments of France, Italy, the Federal German Republic and the United Kingdom is analysed: French cultural diplomacy is presented as the model, and an attempt is made to show how that of the other three varies each in its own way from that model. Italian practice is conditioned by the fact that Italy, unlike France, cannot base its cultural diplomacy on the exploitation of a world language: Italy has however cultivated a special talent for cultural projection by means of the plastic arts, and a penchant for collective cultural diplomacy which finds a convenient outlet in the opportunities provided by Unesco. German cultural diplomacy has had to contend with the complications of a federal structure: this makes of the Federal Republic a potential small-scale model of the future pattern of collective cultural diplomacy among European countries. British cultural diplomacy is, like the French, based on the exploitation of a world language. But it is conducted in its essentials not by the Government of the United Kingdom, but by the British Council, an agency which enjoys a large measure of independence of that government: this makes the British experience exceptional. Nevertheless the national variations do no more than emphasise different aspects of a common theme.

Part III is devoted to the "Collective experience" of three groups of countries in the field of cultural diplomacy. Attention is first given to the largely homogeneous group of five Nordic countries, which first evolved a practice of collective cultural diplomacy among themselves, and then, after many years, gave statutory recognition to this practice in a treaty. By way of contrast, the five signatories of the Brussels Treaty, later to be expanded into the seven of Western European Union, worked out a system of collective cultural co-operation in order to implement a clause of a treaty: in their case, the treaty preceded, whereas in the case of the Nordic countries the treaty followed, the practice of collective cultural co-operation.

The third group of countries whose collective experience in this field is examined is the twenty-one members of the Council for Cultural Co-operation and of the Conference of European Ministers of Education – that is the Members of the Council of Europe and the other European governments which have acceded to the European Cultural Convention. Here the initiative came from a parliamentary body, the Consultative Assembly of the Council of Europe. The response of the Committee of Ministers of the Council of Europe to this parliamentary initiative was first to set up a Committee of Cultural Experts, next to open a European Cultural Convention for signature by governments, then to institute a Cultural Fund, and finally to create the Council for Cultural Co-operation – the only European intergovernmental organisation wholly devoted to the practice of collective cultural diplomacy.

With the creation of the Council for Cultural Co-operation, the seven of Western European Union (all equally Members of the Council of Europe) allowed their own practice of collective cultural diplomacy to be absorbed into that of the larger body, which incorporated their experience into its own. The five Nordic governments, on the contrary, continued to practise and indeed intensify cultural co-operation among themselves, while simultaneously participating in the work of the Council for Cultural Co-operation of the Council of Europe. The unresolved question at the moment is whether the enlarged European Communities of the Nine will develop a practice of cultural co-operation of their own, and equally continue their participation in the work of the twenty-one-member Council for Cultural Co-operation.

Why do European governments indulge in cultural diplomacy, whether unilateral, bilateral or collective, and what is the nature of this steadily-growing activity? *Cultural Diplomacy in Europe* attempts to give the reader an opportunity of answering these questions.

PART I

DIPLOMACY FINDS A NEW TECHNIQUE

I.

EVOLUTION OF CULTURAL DIPLOMACY

1. When Homer, some two and a half millenia ago, described Odysseus as "the man of many devices who wandered far and wide . . . saw the cities of many peoples, and got to know how their minds worked", he was enunciating the basic theme of international cultural relations. The great travel stories of the world, whether imagined or experienced, appeal to man's curiosity about such of his fellow-men as live in conditions which differ from those to which he is himself accustomed. The history of travellers' tales is as old as the history of man.

Travel, once difficult and dangerous and consequently practised only by the adventurous few, has recently become available to the unadventurous many. The tourist agency has learned to derive commercial advantage from providing easy facilities for travel. This would not have proved possible but for man's inherent curiosity about his unfamiliar fellow-man living in other countries. Nowadays we are hearing about cultural tourism, suited to those who have a hunger for the more creative achievements of the peoples whose countries they wish to visit. On a still higher intellectual level are those whose interests are directed towards persons of outstanding excellence in some specialised branch of learning from whom they wish to seek illumination. Sometimes this illumination requires personal contact: more often it can be achieved by correspondence, or simply by a study of the sage's writings. National learned societies normally maintain correspondence, and promote the interchange of visits, with similar national societies in other countries to satisfy this demand. In each instance, whether at the lowest touristic level or at the higher peaks of learning, action is inspired by man's inborn desire to learn what is in the other man's mind, and how it is expressed: or in other words, by the Odysseus-motif.

In earlier centuries, international cultural relations have been, for the most part, planned and carried out by private initiative. Government support has, indeed, been frequently sought by private persons, and sometimes obtained – as, for example, by Christopher Columbus. Infrequently, governments have taken the initiative – as when Captain Cook was sent on a scientific mission, or men of learning accompanied Napoleon on his expedition to Egypt. But the systematic exploitation by governments of the curiosity of the public of other countries for purposes of commercial or political advantage is a recent development.

For it is to be feared that it was not the Odysseus-motif that prompted governments to engage regularly in cultural diplomacy, or purposive intervention in international cultural relations. Since the term "cultural diplomacy" is not yet of wide currency, and since those who have used it do not all agree on its exact meaning, it will be well to declare at the outset what significance is attached to it in the present book. The term "cultural diplomacy" is herein applied to the activities of governments in the sphere -- traditionally left to private enterprise – of international cultural relations.

It will be found that cultural diplomacy, like the Greek verb, has three numbers – singular, dual and plural. In the period between the two world wars, when intervention by governments in international cultural relations became common practice, cultural diplomacy was mainly, if not entirely, limited to the singular number, recognisable under the now outmoded title of "cultural propaganda". To some persons, this association has given to cultural diplomacy a pejorative sense, so that they do not like to use the term as a means of describing the more recent developments in the collective cultural co-operation which forms the principal subject of this book. Let it therefore be stated at once that "cultural diplomacy" is here regarded as a technique which can be used for good purposes or bad, and is therefore strictly neutral in its connotations.

This book is concerned essentially with cultural diplomacy, more especially in its third or plural number, as developed and practised by non-communist European governments since the second world war. But the first and second numbers will have to be described before the third becomes comprehensible. And since France led the world in introducing the techniques of cultural diplomacy, it is with France that this study must begin.

The effervescence which carried French culture all over Europe, particularly in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, was no purposive act of government policy, but a spontaneous ebullition of the civilisation of Europe's foremost state – accidentally fostered by the revocation of the Edict of Nantes, which dispersed so many French Protestants, who took with them the language and style of thinking of their country. It was for the benefit of the children of Huguenot refugees in Prussia that the first French college abroad was founded in 1689. Chance, rather than any governmental design, had caused the Venetian Marco Polo to dictate his memoirs in French so long ago as the end of the thirteenth century; took Rabelais to Rome in the fifteenth, Descartes to Stockholm in the seventeenth, Voltaire to Berlin and Diderot to St Petersburg in the eighteenth; moved Peter the Great of Russia to employ a French architect to build him a palace outside his new capital of St Petersburg, and Frederick the Great to impose the French language on the Prussian Court. And though it was an act of policy that resulted in French superseding Latin as the language of diplomacy in the early eighteenth century, this had been made possible by the spontaneous expansion of French culture and in despite of the turning of the tide against France's military successes.

By the time of the Revolution, French had become the language of continental Europe's many courts and of its cultural aristocracy. Such was the power of the Odysseus-motif, acting upon the enlightened inhabitants of non-French Europe, to draw men's minds towards what was now the recognised centre of the whole continent's civilisation. It was the revolutionaries who first began to sense the advantages of exploiting this Odysseus-motif among the peoples of Europe to whom French arms were carrying the revolution's ideas.

It did not, of course, happen all at once. In fact the mission of learned men who accompanied Napoleon's army to Egypt went, not to propagate French culture, but to study the history and civilisation of Egypt and to make them known to the world. The long-term benefits to French prestige of this exercise might have taught the world that people are more favourably impressed by a sincere attempt to understand *them* than by an effort directed at persuading them to understand *you*.

But this excellent start, devoted to the satisfaction of the Odysseus-motif of the learned men of France, was succeeded by its opposite, the imposition of French as the administrative language of the conquered peoples. The non-French territories were to be subjected to the unifying influence of a commonly-shared French tongue. Cultural diplomacy had begun.

2. The raw material of cultural diplomacy is thought, the perception of thought, the expression of thought, the communication of thought, the diffusion of thought. "Through linguistic policy, through the influence of the Declaration of the Rights of Man and of all the ideas of the Revolution, as well as by the implanting of the Civil Code in numerous countries, the years 1789 to 1815 mark a turning-point in the history of French penetration abroad."[1]* Then the Empire collapsed, and with it the practice of government intervention in cultural matters came to an end.

But private initiative picked up the fallen reins. The year 1846 saw the creation of the archaeological *École française d'Athènes;* 1873 that of its sister foundation in Rome. The first Franco-foreign *lycée*, the Galata-Sarai in Constantinople, was opened in 1868. In 1883 a number of prominent Frenchmen laid the foundations of the "*Alliance*

---

* The notes are listed at the end of each chapter.

française for the propagation of the French language in the colonies and in foreign lands". In 1902 the ***Mission laïque française*** was founded with the object of promoting lay teaching and thereby maintaining and extending French influence abroad.

This is how the operation was seen by those pioneer students of cultural diplomacy, McMurry and Lee:

> France first among modern nations recognised the advantages of a large-scale program of cultural relations with other countries. During the latter half of the nineteenth century the French Government, through the French Catholic teaching missionaries, carried on extensive religious, educational and philanthropic works in the Near and in the Far East. Schools, hospitals, orphanages, dispensaries, and agricultural institutions were established in the eastern countries, especially in the Mediterranean Basin . . .
>
> "What political operation or armed invasion was ever able, with less expenditure, to produce such important results?" asked M. Boucher, Deputy, reporting to the Chamber of Deputies on these activities in 1900.[2]

It was in 1900 that a special bureau was created in the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, entitled the Bureau of Schools and French Works *(oeuvres)* Abroad, to keep in touch with, and to subsidise, schools and welfare organisations maintained abroad by French private initiative.

In the first phase of her cultural diplomacy, Germany was not far behind France. For at least a hundred years before the unification of 1871, there had been a spontaneous diffusion of German culture from some of the princely courts. So early as 1829, a German archaeological institute was founded in Rome by private initiative, and soon gained the active patronage of the future King William IV of Prussia. Between 1830 and 1870 no less than thirty-eight German schools were founded in foreign countries; in the 1870s the archaeological institute in Rome was adopted by the government, which also began to subsidise schools and churches abroad. A Section for Art and Science was established in the Ministry of Foreign Affairs in 1896, and a Schools Section in 1906; an exchange of university professors between Germany and the United States was initiated in 1905.

The creation of Italian schools in foreign countries dates back to 1880. In 1889 a number of prominent Italians drew up a Manifesto calling attention to the need for the active propagation of Italian culture in foreign countries; from this was born the Dante Alighieri Society, which succeeded in maintaining large-scale operations without a government subsidy until 1960, when it obtained financial support from the government.

After the end of the Napoleonic experiment, therefore, the nineteenth century saw the major countries of Europe leave the expansion of their cultural influence to private initiative. Like the French, the Germans and the Italians, the British too built schools and churches in those foreign lands where they had expatriate communities. The foundation of cultural institutions abroad — the *Écoles françaises* of Athens and Rome, the German archaeological institute in Rome, and the British schools of archaeology in Athens and Rome and the British Institute in Florence – was aimed in the first instance at satisfying the wants of the compatriots of their founders; any spin-off in the form of cultural prestige abroad was a secondary consideration. But this secondary consideration was already being acted upon by two governments – the French and the German – when they made institutional and budgetary provision within their Ministries of Foreign Affairs to encourage cultural activities in foreign countries.

Between the beginning of the twentieth century and the outbreak of the first world war there was a slow but steady increase (from small beginnings) of French educational activity in foreign countries, and its subsidisation by the government through the budget of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. By a curious paradox, the government which separated Church and State in 1905 soon found itself impelled to subsidise French Catholic schools abroad; to replace them all immediately by lay schools was not a practical possibility, and to starve them of funds would have diminished French cultural influence. For if the original purpose of these schools was to provide a French education for the children of French parents resident in foreign countries, foreign children were being more and more attracted to the French schools, particularly in countries of a lower educational level.

In 1905 an initiative was taken which was to have lasting results. Agreement was reached for the exchange of *assistants,* or pupil-teachers, between the Ministries of Education of France and England, and of France and Prussia. Similar agreements followed in 1906 with Scotland, in 1907 with Saxony and Austria, in 1912 with Bavaria and Hessen. These *assistants* taught their own language and something about their own country in the school to which they were sent, where they studied the language which they were going to teach on returning to their own country.

In 1910 the *Bureau des écoles et des œuvres françaises à l'étranger* of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs found itself supported by a new *Office national des universités et écoles françaises,* which had links with both the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and the Ministry of Public Instruction. This new public body helped to promote the creation abroad, under the sponsorship of certain French universities, of the now famous *Instituts français* in a number of European cities. These French Institutes had from the start a twofold mission – to provide facilities for French research students to pursue on the spot studies related to the countries in which the Institutes were located, and at the same time to afford to French-speaking foreigners an opportunity to deepen their understanding of French culture in their own countries.

In Germany, the expression "cultural policy" began to be used in the early years of this century. The growth of German industry and the expansion of German trade were resulting in a steady increase in the number of Germans living in foreign countries. The German Government was concerned that these expatriate Germans should not become absorbed into the countries of their residence. The maintenance of Germanism abroad became the accepted aim of cultural policy. Between 1900 and 1913 the sums available in the budget of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs for the support of German schools abroad rose from 150 000 to 1 500 000 marks. The appropriation for "schools and works" abroad in the budget of the French Ministry of Foreign Affairs in 1913 reached 1 600 000 francs.

3. The first world war saw the creation and rapid development, among the principal combatant nations, of government departments of political propaganda, designed to make a contribution to the war effort by impressing upon public opinion in other countries a sense of the rightness, and of the efficacy, of the political aims and military methods of the propagandising department's governments. Even the Government of the United Kingdom, which had totally neglected cultural propaganda (surely British prestige was universally recognised, and needed no artificial support), now made a powerful effort in the field of political propaganda. France and Germany maintained their pre-war cultural activities abroad alongside this new political adjunct to their war effort.

At the close of hostilities, the Government of the United Kingdom not only abandoned its political propaganda, but also continued for many years to make no effort in the direction of cultural propaganda. The French and German Governments, on the other hand, immediately recognised that cultural propaganda had possibilities which it was to their interest to exploit.

We have seen that, before the war, German official interest was concerned with keeping alive a sense of Germanism *(Deutschtum)* among Germans living in foreign countries. After the Treaty of Versailles of 1919, the number of Germans, or persons of German origin, living outside Germany had increased. So early as October 1919 Dr Bauer, the German Chancellor, said:

> The thing which no peace treaty can take from us is the feeling of national unity, and what no one can forbid is the fostering of this feeling. Our German racial comrades *(Stammesgenossen)*, who are and who in the future will be separated from us, shall know that we think of them and that we provide for them in all

> ways which the Peace Treaty allows. Not politically, but linguistically and humanly all these relations will be even warmer.
>
> In all areas of culture, in the realm of science, in the social realm, in so far as personal relations and social intercourse are concerned, we will give practical proof of our community of interest and foster the feeling of unity. That is the cultural task of the German Reich.[3]

Five years later a recommendation of the Prussian *Landtag* asked the State Ministry to give greater attention and encouragement to Germanism on the frontiers and abroad, with (among others) the aim of preparing increased means for cultural propaganda *(Kulturpropaganda)* in the endangered areas.[4]

Thus the Weimar Republic resuscitated the cultural diplomacy of the German Empire, destined to serve the policy of maintaining the linguistic and cultural community of Germans abroad with Germans at home. As the instrument of this cultural diplomacy, it created in the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, in 1920, a "Directorate for Germanism abroad and cultural relations". In 1925, the *Deutscher Akademischer Austauschdienst* was set up with the mission of organising the exchange of students and of young university lecturers with foreign countries – a genuine task of international cultural relations, different in kind from the maintenance of *Deutschtum* abroad. This interchange at university level was supplemented at school level by the creation, in 1929, of the *Deutsche Pädagogische Austauschstelle.* Finally the Weimar Republic – in the year before the rise to power of the Hitler regime – saw the foundation, within the framework of the German Academy and in the centenary year of Goethe's death, of the Goethe Institute, which had the task of promoting the teaching of the German language in foreign countries.

If the Treaty of Versailles gave to the German Government a reason for intensifying the policy of promoting *Deutschtum* among Germans abroad, the negotiations which led up to that treaty made the French Government aware of an additional motive for multiplying its activities in the field of cultural propaganda. For two hundred years French had been the recognised language of diplomacy. At the Paris Conference of 1919, English – the language of the United Kingdom, the United States and the British Dominions – was accepted as of equal validity with French in both the proceedings of the conference and the text of the treaty. Since that time French has ceased to be the sole recognised medium of international diplomatic communication. Evidence of the traumatic effect of this loss of linguistic primacy was given by President Pompidou when, in an interview on British television on 17 May 1971 – at a time when talks on the enlargement of the European Economic Community were about to reach their climax – he made the unrealistic claim that French was the natural language of the peoples of Europe, English that of America.

Both in the private and the public sectors, the French moved with speed. In 1919 the *Alliance française* set up a school of practical French language in Paris, which rapidly attracted more than 800 pupils of different nationalities; and in the following year it started a library service which operated in many countries of the east, of central Europe and of the American continent. In 1920 the Ministry of Foreign Affairs completely reorganised its *Service des oeuvres françaises à l'étranger*, to which was voted an annual budget of 17 million francs. Separate from this department, but equally located within the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, was a *Service d'information et de presse*. In his report to the Chamber of Deputies in 1920, M. Noblemaire (Rapporteur of the budget of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs) declared that:

> "Propaganda is nothing but intellectual and moral influence and yet it is the most immediate and most valuable means for seconding the efforts made by this country to establish and develop her material prosperity."[5]

The period between the two world wars saw the introduction of a new element into cultural diplomacy. This was the exploitation of these new techniques by totalitarian dictatorship. The lead was given by the USSR.

In an article published in the *Unesco Handbook of International Exchanges* for 1965, G. A. Mojaev, at that time a Counsellor on the staff of the National Commission of Unesco of the USSR, tells us (on page 77) that:

> The past few years have seen the beginning of an intensive process of development of cultural relations between states with different social and economic systems. It is true that cultural relations of this type were initiated over forty years ago, after the triumph of the October Socialist Revolution. For example, the Soviet Government, in its appeal to the peoples and governments of the world, published on 30 October 1917, announced that its aim was to create conditions such that all peoples could be united by ties of economic and cultural co-operation.

A perceptive analyst of the Soviet Government's operations in this field, Professor Frederick C. Barghoorn, puts it as follows:

> The back-stopping of coexistence propaganda by cultural diplomacy is a much older feature of Soviet foreign policy than is generally realised. Throughout its history VOKS – the All-Union Society for Cultural Relations with Foreign Countries, established in 1925 and replaced in 1958 by a new Union of Soviet Societies for Friendship and Cultural Relations with Foreign Countries – proclaimed as one of the motives for popularising Soviet culture abroad the necessity for mobilising foreign intellectuals against alleged plans for military attack on Soviet Russia.

At the same time, however, Soviet intellectuals and their foreign collaborators were urged not to limit their activity to "disseminating neutral information which often hides a desire to efface our victories", but to engage in militant proselytism. In 1925 Stalin told the fourteenth Congress of the Soviet Communist Party that sojourns of "delegations of workers" from the West, or visits by Indian, Egyptian and Chinese groups – in the case of the Easterners, Stalin said nothing about social origins – constituted "the best, most forceful and active propaganda for the Soviet system against the capitalist system". Orientals, he asserted, would be particularly impressed by Soviet nationality policy. In 1926 he declared that visits by delegations of "foreign proletarians" to Soviet Russia could help to prevent "imperialistic intervention" against the USSR.[6]

It is in this context that Professor Barghoorn gives a brief definition of cultural diplomacy "as the manipulation of cultural materials and personnel for propaganda purposes".[7]

After the overthrow of the Weimar Republic, the Hitler regime in Germany soon came to see cultural diplomacy in the same light as did the Soviet regime in the USSR – namely, as a potentially powerful partner of political propaganda. The name of the Cultural Directorate of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs was changed to Cultural Policy Directorate. The existing machinery of cultural diplomacy abroad was subordinated to the purposes of ideological propaganda, and the policy of fostering Germanism among Germans – and persons of German descent – abroad was degraded into the policy of the fifth column.

The Mussolini regime in Italy found no pre-existing governmental structure of cultural diplomacy ready to hand. In 1926 Italian cultural institutes began to be set up in foreign countries, but it was not until 1938 that an Institute for Cultural Relations with Foreign Countries (IRCE) was created in Rome to co-ordinate the activities of the cultural institutes abroad. By a curious paradox, the IRCE retained a paragovernmental status under the fascist regime, and was not brought within the framework of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs until after the war, when it had ceased to have an ideological mission.

4. It seems to have been the effectiveness of the totalitarian dictatorships' combination of political and cultural propaganda which caused the United Kingdom Government at last to enter the lists. In 1920, shortly after the first world war, Lord Curzon had set up a committee within the Foreign Office to look into the position of British communities abroad and to consider the desirability of encouraging political or commercial propaganda in foreign countries. The committee rejected any form of political propaganda, considered that commercial propaganda could be looked after by British diplomatic

missions abroad, but thought the government should assist British citizens resident abroad to establish schools for the local education of their children. It also advised that facilities should be provided for the reception and education of foreign students at British universities and technical schools, and that British institutes and libraries should be set up in certain foreign capitals. Lord Curzon's initiative was defeated by the opposition of the Treasury.[9]

Not until 1934 did the Foreign Office succeed in setting up a "British Committee for Relations with Other Countries". This committee was to have moral support from a number of government departments; but though it was promised a grant of £ 5 000 from the Foreign Office for the financial year 1935-36, it would be expected to look to private persons and to industry for the bulk of its resources. This pious hope was not fulfilled after the early years: and by the financial year preceding the outbreak of the second world war the grant from the Foreign Office had risen to £ 130 000.

In 1935 the title of the committee was changed to "British Council for Relations with Other Countries", or "British Council" for short. The Prince of Wales became its Patron. It was not until 1940, after the outbreak of war, that it received its Royal Charter; and not until many years after the war that it succeeded in turning its permanent staff into the most professional body of cultural diplomats in the world. Until the outbreak of the second world war it remained an amateur, experimental body of enthusiastic persons who relieved the government of the necessity of becoming directly involved in the distasteful activity of cultural propaganda, while at the same time enabling that government to claim that it had in fact taken steps to counteract the evil effects of the cultural propaganda of the totalitarian states.

If therefore we wish to take stock of the state of cultural diplomacy in Europe on the eve of the second world war, it will be unavailing to look to Germany or to Italy, which are now practising the ideological propaganda of the totalitarian state, or to the United Kingdom, which has got no further than the amateur phase of a new experiment. Only in France has there been consistent progress along a line pioneered in that country, and destined to obtain widespread emulation after the second world war is ended. In fact by 1939 France has not only perfected the techniques of the first phase of cultural diplomacy, or cultural propaganda (and here let me repeat that I use the phrase without any of the sinister connotations resulting from the practice of this technique by the totalitarian states), but has taken the first steps towards the second phase, that of bilateral cultural co-operation.

The year 1936 saw the creation of an interministerial Commission for French action and information abroad. This Commission, attached to the *Présidence du Conseil* (the Prime Minister's office), co-ordinated the efforts of the following departments within three ministries:

– Ministry of Foreign Affairs: French works abroad; Information and Press;

– Ministry of Education: Primary, secondary and higher education; Fine Arts; Universities; National Library;

– Ministry of Public Works: Tourism.

This provided a co-ordinated home base to service the overseas operations in the cultural field of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, which fell into four categories: schools and universities; literary and artistic matters; tourism, sport and cinema; and *oeuvres diverses*. By 1938, the year preceding the outbreak of war, the budget for these activities was slightly in excess of 70 million francs. With this money French institutes, *lycées* and schools were maintained abroad; professors and other staff were made available to fill posts at foreign universities; foreign teachers, students and technicians were brought to France for courses appropriate to their educational level and subject; books, periodicals and financial subsidies were provided for French libraries abroad; the exportation of French books was promoted; theatrical tours, concerts, art exhibitions, film shows were staged; non-governmental French bodies operating in the cultural or charitable field abroad were aided. The presentation of French civilisation to foreigners had become an accepted large-scale part of normal French diplomatic activity.

While thus developing the first phase – cultural propaganda in the legitimate sense – of its cultural diplomacy, France was, between the wars, building stepping-stones towards the second, the bilateral, phase. By the outbreak of war in 1939, the French Government had concluded the forerunners of the later full-scale cultural conventions with thirteen other governments. More will be said later of the accepted post-war type of overall cultural convention: the nineteen conventions concluded between 1919 and 1938 with the aforementioned thirteen governments tended to deal with restricted matters of interchange of students or of cultural material.

The catastrophically total second world war did not put an end to all the developments so far described, but it disrupted some and suspended others. Moreover it brought about the beginnings of a new attitude to cultural diplomacy. The birthplace of this new attitude was, of all unexpected places, the United Kingdom.

Notes to Chapter I

1. Angremy: p. 5.
2. McMurry and Lee: p. 8.
3. Quoted by McMurry and Lee: p. 49.
4. McMurry and Lee: p. 53.
5. Quoted by McMurry and Lee: p. 16.
6. Barghoorn: p. 17.
7. Barghoorn: p. 10.
8. White: p. 2.

II.

RESPONSE TO A NEW CHALLENGE

1. Up to the outbreak of war in 1939, the British Council had been guided by the French example and had concentrated on encouraging anglophil societies in foreign countries, setting up British Institutes in countries where no locally-sponsored anglophil societies existed, giving help to English schools abroad, awarding scholarships to enable foreign students and scholars to study in England, and making occasional ventures into the promotion of British art exhibitions and musical tours overseas. In 1937 it had acquired as its chairman a dynamic personality in Lord Lloyd, a former Governor of Bombay and High Commissioner in Egypt who, when he became Secretary of State for the Colonies and Leader of the House of Lords in 1940, refused to give up the chairmanship, fought for and obtained a Royal Charter for the British Council in 1940, and saved it from the danger of being taken over by the wartime Ministry of Information. By the time of his death in 1941, Lord Lloyd had seen the British Council through a time of danger, when wartime preoccupations might well have caused the government to lose interest in its unofficial cultural department, and had won respect for it in Westminster and Whitehall. It was during Lord Lloyd's chairmanship that the British Council was called upon to make an unprecedented response to an exceptional new challenge.

By September 1939 there were large numbers of German, Austrian and Czechoslovak refugees in Britain and the Poles were beginning to arrive. Their position, difficult before the declaration of war, was likely to become more so after it. It was the representative of the Board of Education on the Executive Committee of the British Council who persuaded Lord Lloyd that the social and cultural needs of these refugees presented an opportunity which the Council should not neglect.

A paper was put before the Executive Committee which described the case for action in the following terms. The object of the British Council was to promote social and cultural relations between the people of Britain and the peoples of other countries; one branch of its work should be the promotion of such relations with citizens of other countries who were resident in Britain during the war.

There were many Germans, Austrians and Czechs who had sought a refuge in Britain to escape the present tyranny in their own countries.

They hoped to have escaped from bad manners and inhospitable treatment to good manners and generous behaviour. The British Council should bring about the realisation of this hope. On the grounds of compassion alone the British Council should have a concern for these people: and from the point of view of the objects of the Council, nothing could be more effective than that these people should be able to say, day by day, that they were in fact meeting with courtesy, generosity and good manners in the country which claimed that its life was based on values which were the antithesis of those which then dominated the countries from which they had escaped.

"Many of these refugees will wish to return to their own countries when the war is won. They will not then recount to their fellow-citizens the propaganda in favour of Britain which they have read or heard. They will say how they were treated . . . In short, truth about Britain is not what we say or write about it, but how we behave."

Though the problem was one which mainly affected refugees, the Council should not neglect citizens of other countries who in time of war might feel themselves somewhat isolated. The Council should pay special attention to those foreign students who, because of the war, were deprived of opportunities of regular attendance at universities and might, as individuals, suffer a great deal and, as a class, become disaffected.

In the month of October 1939 the Executive Committee of the British Council authorised the formation of a "Resident Foreigners Committee" and allotted the sum of £1 000 for six months to promote the social and cultural welfare of peoples from other countries resident in the United Kingdom for the duration of the war.

In May 1940, after several days at sea, four hundred Belgian fishing boats reached Brixham in Devon. They were loaded to the water's edge with men, women and children. There was no food or drinking water left. They had come to stay until the end of the war.

Brixham shops were opened for the night and the bakers set to baking. Beds were somehow found and the life of the Belgian community in Brixham had begun. The men settled down to their fishing among the hazards of war: the children to a school life side by side with the English, but receiving daily instruction in their own languages. The Belgian Government in London transferred to Brixham their school for the training of fishing apprentices. To keep the fishing fleet in repair they set up an engineering works. The Dutch Government established a school for divers. The British Council provided an Anglo-Belgian Club, the restaurant of which was furnished from the cross-channel steamer, *Prince Baudouin*. Though the majority of the French fishermen had gone to Penzance in Cornwall, there were some Bretons in Brixham. They too had their club.

2. By the middle of 1940 the trickle of peaceful invaders had become a flood, of which the Belgian fishermen at Brixham were only a small part. There were now not only civilian refugees, but large bodies of troops, governments and ministries, aircraft and warships. This was the first invasion. The next, which began a good deal later, was represented by the arrival of large Canadian and American forces of all kinds: while the dangers of the sea, and the need for ships to travel in convoy, meant that great numbers of seamen who might be Greek, Chinese, Indian or Russian were detained in port for unusually long periods. To these were added various groups of war workers, sometimes in very remote parts of the country, such as foresters from Newfoundland in the north of Scotland.

Accordingly the summer of 1940 saw the beginning of a period of intense activity. London became the seat of the exiled Governments of Belgium, the Netherlands, Norway, Czechoslovakia, Poland, Luxembourg and Yugoslavia and of the French National Committee of Liberation under General de Gaulle. The establishment of these communities and of the exiled governments was naturally a matter for the United Kingdom Government itself. But it was quickly recognised that the cultural welfare of these guest communities was important for their moral. The British Council was accordingly made officially responsible for the educational and cultural welfare of allied civilians and merchant seamen.

Arrangements had to be made, and were developed during the coming years, for the education of large numbers of foreign children whether in local schools as at Brixham, or in boarding schools such as the Norwegian school at Drumtochty in Scotland and the French *lycée* evacuated from London to the Lake District. This educational activity was especially extensive in the large Polish community which settled in Scotland. There were separate experiments in higher education such as the Polish Medical Faculty at the University of Edinburgh and the Polish architects' school at that of Liverpool. Various training establishments were set up. In addition it became necessary to teach the English language to the armed forces of all the allied nations: partly for operational, partly for social reasons.

In London the British Council found itself co-operating with allied governments to establish national centres to act as clubs, educational institutes and general rallying places for their communities. These were provided for Greeks, Czechs, Poles, Belgians, Dutch, Norwegians. The *Institut français* in London, now cut off from its sources of income in France, was maintained by annual grants from the British Government, administered by the British Council. On the liberation of France, the French Government chose to regard these grants as a loan, which it immediately repaid.

Nor was it sufficient to establish such centres in London and they gradually spread over the country wherever the congregation of allied personnel made it advisable: sometimes on a national basis, sometimes international: the Polish Hearth in Peebles and the Allied Centre in Liverpool: sometimes small and sometimes large. The process was complicated by the hazards of war and the Allied Centre in Liverpool was completely destroyed by bombing ten days after it had been opened in April 1941: new premises were found with remarkable speed, and the Centre was promptly re-opened. In the port of Cardiff the British Council found itself involved in the unfamiliar task of providing a mosque for the Moslem community.

Thus while the Ministers and officials of the allied governments were in close and regular contact with one another and with the host government in London, the country became dotted with foreign communities to an extent that was without precedent. The British Council, which up to the outbreak of war had been almost wholly concerned with making the British way of life known in other countries, and only to a very limited extent in taking an interest in foreign students and scholars whom it had brought to Britain, now found itself driven by war out of a number of countries in which it had previously operated. Britain, on the other hand, was now the temporary home of a number of the British Council's potential clients. In addition to carrying out its normal mission of British cultural propaganda among these temporary residents, the British Council learned that they needed help in maintaining as much as they could of their own culture and way of life in their period of exile. This led to a practice of bilateral cultural co-operation, and in some instances to a measure of multilateral cultural co-operation as well.

3. By 1943 the British Council was, in one way or another, and excluding naval, military and air force units, giving help to 365 foreign and Commonwealth centres in 59 British towns; 156 were national centres; 209 international. About 100 of these were concerned with seamen.

One of the more interesting branches of the British Council's work for the overseas communities related to merchant seamen, though this did not long survive the economics of the post-war period. In the past little had been done to enable the overseas seaman to get to know more of the country he was visiting than the immediate and often sordid neighbourhood of the docks. There was little or no provision for his more intellectual interests.

In the British Council's centres at the great ports, seamen of many nationalities became one of the Council's main concerns. Thus in 1941 arrangements were first made for the officers and crews of Russian ships to visit places of interest in the surrounding country. In 1942 one party of a hundred and fifty Russians is recorded as having visited collieries in the north-east, where they were entertained by the miners, and at village schools to see athletic displays. Free seats at theatres and trips to places of historic interest were arranged. There were football matches and an exchange of courtesies between the Lord Mayor and senior officers. Many subsequent arrivals were thus entertained likewise. Other random examples are the reception at Liverpool of a group of Congolese seamen who had spent four days in a lifeboat and the making of leave arrangements for Chinese naval cadets.

From the point of view of the future conduct of cultural relations, probably the most instructive development in the British Council's work with foreign nationals in Britain during the war related to professional co-operation. The phrase used at the time was "inter-occupational contacts", and the work related particularly to the US and Commonwealth armed forces.

This branch of the work soon grew large. First consultations with the Commonwealth forces took place early in 1942 and with the American forces towards the end of that year. It was important to provide interesting activities for leave periods, free week-ends and so on, and it was soon found that a common peacetime profession or occupation was the best basis for this. By the end of 1942 there was a growing demand from members of all forces for contacts with British members of the serviceman's peacetime profession. All kinds of people took part in these visits, from morticians to bee-keepers. A typical cross-section is given in the following report:

> An American wishing to study the English law of negligence, a Belgian requiring information on cellular concrete, a chemical engineer from South Africa also interested in the manufacture of concrete, a Norwegian auditor wishing to meet a chartered accountant, a Canadian interested in the manufacture of porcelain, a Canadian bee-keeper wishing to spend his leave at a commercial apiary, a French naval rating seeking advice from an expert on wood carving, a Dutch tea taster wishing to be put in touch with two particular firms, a South African breeder of fat lambs, who wished to discuss cross-breeding with some authority on the type of meat required for the British market, three Canadian experimental wheat-farmers wishing to visit an institute at Cambridge, two Norwegians anxious to spend short periods at the Rothamsted experimental station and a tractor driver from West Africa who wished to spend his leave helping on a farm.

Leave courses were also organised for a similar purpose. These increased in number as time went on and in the year ending March 1945 one hundred and forty-one such courses were attended by 3 738 officers and men. The subjects ranged from Shakespeare and Veterinary Science to Civic Administration and the Shape of Things to Come. None of them were held in London.

It was on the experience gained in these activities that the British Council was to base its post-war programmes of inward visits and courses. Two things were found essential: professional interest and a provincial organisation.

4. These contacts arranged by the British Council in co-operation with the European allied governments and the United States and Commonwealth authorities represented what came to be known as a "two-way traffic". Not only did the visiting overseas people get to know about life and thought in Britain, but the British got to know their visitors. It was the British local authorities in particular who learned to know the people from overseas – mayors, town clerks, chief constables, medical officers, directors of education, editors of local newspapers – and became familiar with the pattern of work. This was to prove of great value after the war. To the British Council itself it also meant a strong element of popular support throughout the country from people who knew at first hand what the Council actually did.

An interesting feature of this "two-way traffic" was that the British Council now became involved in giving help to the European allied governments in their own effort to project their countries in Britain, for example in a series of national exhibitions which toured the country and in the programme of the national centres in London, Edinburgh and elsewhere.

The examples given above represent only a part of a much wider programme, of which the following give some further indications: the grant of scholarships for study at universities; the fortnightly receptions for those who had escaped from the continent of Europe in rowing boats and stolen aeroplanes; the newsreel shown weekly to 250 000 American soldiers; the 10 000 packets of literature sent to allied patients in hospitals; the publication of a large series of small guide books to places of interest.

One of the earlier efforts of the British Council in the field of bilateral cultural diplomacy during the war deserves special mention. The year was 1940: the day the *Quatorze Juillet*. Many thousands of French soldiers had recently been evacuated to Britain from the beaches of Dunkirk: they were encamped at Aldershot. On the occasion of their national day, the British Council offered them a cinema show, with the feature film of their own choice, at a huge cinema opposite Victoria station. Mounted police had to be called out to control the cheering crowds who watched the French troops march into the cinema. There they were welcomed by the Chairman of the British Council and addressed by General de Gaulle.

The French soldiers were seated in three sections – those who had decided to remain in England and continue the war under the leadership of General de Gaulle, those who had elected to return to France, and those who had not yet made up their minds. The programme was built round the film *Carnet de bal*. Afterwards the French troops marched to the Central Hall, Westminster, where the actress Alice Delysia led them in singing the *Marseillaise*. It was an event which those who participated are not likely to forget.

5. We saw at the end of the last chapter how the French Government had, even before the outbreak of war in 1939, concluded with thirteen other governments the forerunners of the full-scale cultural conventions which were to become standard practice when the war was over. Other countries too had moved along the same path: by 1939 Poland was a party to ten such agreements, Czechoslovakia nine, and Belgium eight. A small beginning had even been made, between the two world wars, in a totally new concept of multilateral co-operation in the cultural and educational field. Two instruments had been created to give effect to this new idea: the Institute of Intellectual Co-operation, set up in Paris by the League of Nations, and the more or less independent International Bureau of Education in Geneva. Though "intellectual co-operation" was defined as including artistic, literary, scientific and educational relations between peoples, both the title and the spirit of the Institute's activities would be judged somewhat austere and theoretical by the standards which became applicable after the war. The Institute had issued a number of interesting publications and had tackled the vital question of the impartial teaching of history by producing in 1937, after three years of negotiation, a Declaration on the Teaching of History which few of the European governments had any mind to adopt. The Geneva Bureau, once it had reorganised itself so as to include official representation of governments, did a certain amount of useful work in purely educational matters. Meanwhile support was growing in educational circles, in America as well as in Europe, for the idea of creating a new international educational organisation.

It was the exceptional circumstance of the presence in the United Kingdom of so many governments in exile during the war, and the activities in which the British Council had become involved through trying to help in meeting some of the educational and cultural requirements of multifarious national communities living temporarily in a strange land, which provided the impetus towards a great new venture.

On the initiative of what had by then become the British Council's "Home Division", and with the approval of the President of the Board of Education, Mr R. A. Butler (later to become Lord Butler of Saffron Walden), and of the Foreign Office, soundings were taken among the Ministers of Education of the allied governments in London. The response was favourable, and the stage was thus set for a development that was to give a new direction to cultural diplomacy in Europe.

6. On 20 October 1942 the Chairman of the British Council, by now Sir Malcolm Robertson, addressed a letter to the Ministers of Education of the allied governments and to Professor René Cassin, French National Commissionar for Justice and Education. The letter stated that after consultation with the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs and with his approval, Mr Butler had asked Sir Malcolm to invite the Ministers to a conference on 16 November at the Board of Education. It would be of value, Sir Malcolm wrote, "to have periodical meetings when educational questions affecting the allied countries of Europe and the United Kingdom, both during the war period and in the post-war period, could be discussed". The Board of Education and the British Council had given some consideration to the "main general questions on which an exchange of views and the compilation of information might be of educational value to the peoples of the countries of Europe and of the United Kingdom".

Accordingly the first plenary session of the Conference of Allied Ministers of Education, hereinafter described as CAME, took place in Belgrave Square on 16 November 1942. Mr R. A. Butler presided. Nine countries took part. In his brief opening speech the President said he was very conscious of the unique opportunity afforded by the presence of so many allied educational authorities for collaboration on educational questions affecting the allied countries of Europe and the United Kingdom both during and after the war. He felt that discussions on these problems could best take the form of periodic meetings between the representatives of the allied education departments, the Board of Education and the British Council. At these meetings it would be essential, he felt, to concentrate on specific and perhaps modest practical issues, rather than enter on wider discussion of nebulous and ambitious plans which might later prove impracticable. The President then advised the conference to confine its discussions to matters connected with the war period. The education departments of the allied governments had been in close and fruitful co-operation with the British Council for some considerable time on the many problems which had arisen concerning the education of their nationals in the United Kingdom and must, the President said, be familiar with the aims and ideals of the Council, which could be regarded as the education department of the Foreign Office and the foreign department of the Board of Education. There were, however, probably further ways in which British education authorities could be of assistance to the allied education departments.

The Board of Education then put forward some very modest proposals of a short-term nature for greater co-operation during the remainder of the war. But before the meeting ended, the Ministers had agreed to meet again in two months' time and then give thought to the immediate post-war period.

The conference met twenty-one times in a period of three years and, not many months after the end of the war, decided on 5 December 1945 that its work was done. It had operated through an Executive Bureau which met thirty-seven times, and through commissions set up to make recommendations in the fields of: books and periodicals; cultural conventions; science; films, broadcasting and similar aids; protection and restitution of cultural material; basic scholastic equipment; and special educational problems in liberated countries. By the time it concluded its work, CAME had extended its membership to seventeen countries: Australia, Belgium, Canada, China, Czechoslovakia, France, Greece, India, Yugoslavia, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, South Africa, the United Kingdom, the United States and the USSR.

Although the conference set itself two main objectives, namely wartime co-operation and immediate post-war reconstruction, it is with its more enduring results that we are here concerned. Before considering these, however, it is worth while to reflect a little, in the light of post-war developments, upon two opportunities which were missed.

The first missed opportunity was that of failing to maintain the conference in existence. It seems that the Ministers of Education, to whom co-operation made sense in the context of a wartime emergency, simply did not think of working together when that particular emergency had come to an end. Fourteen years were to pass between the disbandment of CAME and the time when a Minister of Education of the Netherlands was to convene a meeting of seven Ministers of Education which gave rise to a series of meetings at which more and more countries were represented: we shall give attention at the proper time to the Conference of European Ministers of Education, of which CAME was the unwitting forerunner.

The second opportunity which was missed was that of linking the activities of CAME with a development of outstanding importance which was simultaneously, and much more actively, engaging Mr Butler's attention. For while CAME was holding its sessions, its President was simultaneously preparing, and steering through parliament, what is now known as the Butler Act of 1944, whereby the educational system of England and Wales was completely overhauled so as to be brought into conformity with a new social and political philosophy precipitated by the war, and at the same time adapted to Britain's post-war society.

It did not seem to occur to anyone to regard the future education of the children of Europe in the new society which would grow out of the war as a single operation. CAME in fact started a new fashion in cultural diplomacy; but its implications only came to be felt over a period of years. When in 1959 the Minister of Education of the Netherlands convened the first Conference of European Ministers of Education, he did so *because* he was engaged in overhauling his country's educational system. He realised the continuing value of a collective pooling of ideas.

7. The Books and Periodicals Commission of CAME turned its thoughts to a number of problems. One of these was the supply of publications to libraries in occupied Europe after the liberation. An organisation known as the Inter-Allied Book Centre was set up: by the end of the war it had assembled close on 400 000 books and several thousand periodicals which were despatched to their destinations as soon as transport became available. It also gave detailed consideration to the problems which would face the European book trade after the war, and advised the governments what measures would need to be taken to promote the widest possible circulation of books across national frontiers. Discussion took place on the supply of printing machinery and of paper; and detailed recommendations were made designed to ensure better practice in the matter of translations.

In addition to giving attention to these and other problems of immediate post-war reconstruction, the Books and Periodicals Commission pursued two major objectives, one of which it carried to completion while the other it had to hand over for future action elsewhere. The uncompleted project was aimed at providing for teachers a book aimed at eliminating national bias from the teaching of history. The project which it brought to a triumphant conclusion was the publication, in three volumes, by the Clarendon Press, Oxford, in 1954, of *The European Inheritance*. There were ten contributors, of various nationalities, and the work, edited by the Chairman of the Commission, Sir Ernest Barker, covers Europe's development from prehistoric times to the outbreak of the second world war.

One of CAME's preoccupations was the restitution of looted *objets d'art*, scientific equipment, books and archives. Scientific equipment was entrusted to the conference's Science Commission: other agencies seemed to be concerning themselves with the other matters, so the conference set up, on the recommendation of the Librarian of the US Congress, Mr Archibald MacLeish, what came to be known, from its Chairman, as the Vaucher Commission, with the following terms of reference:

> To collect from all available sources (including the allied governments concerned) the fullest possible information as to the damage, destruction and looting of monuments, works of art and cultural material of all sorts in the occupied countries; to act as a pool for such information; and to offer its services in any other useful capacity to such military or civil authorities as may now or hereafter be concerned with the public administration of any liberated territory which may be occupied by the allied forces.

The main tasks of the Vaucher Commission were to assemble and disseminate information on the damage sustained, the personnel thought to be concerned with the removal of objects, and their possible whereabouts: and to provide a link between the various national commissions with similar objects later set up by individual governments. "Through these activities," it was stated at the time,

> a concentrated effort has been made on the part of representatives of the allied nations for the immediate protection and ultimate restitution of the cultural heritage of Western civilisation.

The Science Commission tackled the formidable task of assembling details of the scientific and laboratory equipment which would be required for educational purposes in the occupied countries after liberation. In a matter of two years the commission succeeded in preparing inventories of basic scientific equipment needed for the teaching of chemistry, physics and biology at three educational levels, primary, secondary and university. Inventories in respect of medical and engineering teaching at university level were also compiled. At the final meeting of the conference in December 1945 the Science Commission was able to report that its inventories "constitute a unique catalogue of the necessary equipment of laboratories for a wide range of sciences, such as has never before existed".

In the last year of its existence the conference set up a Commission of Enquiry on Special Educational Problems in the Liberated Countries. The commission's enquiry covered deficiencies in education, the effects of war occupation on physical and mental health, moral values and delinquency, special categories of children and young people (in particular Jewish children and the children of "collaborators" and the special activities on behalf of such children of national organisations in their own countries acting internationally.

In addition to a Commission on Basic Scholastic Equipment, the conference created one on Audio-Visual Aids. The latter commission set up a Sub-Committee on School Broadcasting and another on Emergency Aids to Teachers: and made a large number of practical recommendations for the future provision of wireless apparatus, film projectors, mobile film units, epidiascopes and other equipment.

8. In a paper circulated to the second meeting of the conference, M. Jules Hoste of Belgium remarked:

> If the United Nations wish to ensure a lasting co-operation, it is of the greatest importance that intellectual relations between Great Britain and the different European countries offering resistance to National-Socialist Germany and Fascist Italy be drawn closer together . . .

> Intellectual rapprochement in its true sense can be conceived only in an atmosphere of mutual understanding and on a basis of equality, whatever the numerical importance of the nations in question.
>
> The Institute of Intellectual Co-operation attached to the League of Nations has no doubt helped to strengthen the intellectual bonds between nations and it is to be hoped that international pressure will be brought to bear for a continuance of this action.
>
> But the activity of the Institute of Intellectual Co-operation has remained too theoretical, and a more practical and far-reaching line of action must be envisaged . . .
>
> Belgium has signed intellectual agreements with France, Holland, Poland and Czechoslovakia; she refused in the case of Germany and Italy, but with Great Britain not even a preliminary exchange of views took place.
>
> These agreements are comparatively easy of realisation and are generally of practical purpose . . .
>
> These intellectual treaties have yielded the most satisfactory results and have incontestably contributed towards the rapprochement existing between the university centres of the various countries in question. Might not similar agreements be concluded with Great Britain?

The United Kingdom had not yet concluded any cultural agreements, though a convention with Greece had been signed but remained unratified as a result of the war.

The conference, taking note of this paper, set up a commission with M. Hoste as Chairman, and terms of reference which required the commission to consider drafting a model convention. To this point the commission gave careful consideration, but came to the conclusion that a draft model convention could not be set forth without the risk of misunderstanding.

> The traditions, circumstances and preferences of the nations are different, and so too are the ways in which any two of them are wont to collaborate on the intellectual and cultural plane. It is vitally important that these considerations should find place in the phrasing and in the choice of topics of each general convention. The absence of certain topics in a draft model convention of universal applicability might seem to forbid their appearance in such documents; the presence of others might be unwelcome to any particular government. In either case the draft model might suggest a limitation on the freedom of each pair of contracting governments to determine their convention in the manner best agreeing with their joint traditions.

The commission therefore submitted not a draft model convention but general recommendations with suggestions of the form and content of conventions to which Great Britain might be a party, together with a historical and analytical account and selected specimens of existing conventions. The commission thought that its report would place at the disposal of the governments when considering the advisability of entering into a bilateral negotiation both complete freedom of deliberation and the means of securing essential uniformity in their treaties.

The commission did not exclude from its thinking the possibility of a general cultural agreement, but it realised the difficulty in fact of reaching practical results in that way. The League of Nations and the Institute of Intellectual Co-operation had worked out an instrument of that kind entitled the "Declaration of Geneva concerning the Teaching of History". The aim was to effect a revision of school manuals so that the teaching of history should not be given a characteristic and imperialistic trend. Negotiations to determine the tenor of this instrument were to have been started in 1934 but the final text was only settled on 20 October 1937. The commission conceived that after the war the United Nations would desire to conclude a general intellectual agreement. Such an agreement might be inspired by the general agreement for intellectual co-operation concluded in 1938, which provided for the creation in each country of a unit for intellectual co-operation. This remoter possibility, the commission thought, lay outside its scope. It would be on the basis of the realistic solutions contemplated and exemplified in their report that the most fruitful, practical results might be obtained. The drawbacks of bilateralism would be reduced to a minimum if negotiating governments inserted in all agreements the same, or nearly the same, provisions.

CAME accepted the definition of the purpose of intellectual agreements given in the *Recueil des accords intellectuels* published by the Institute of Intellectual Co-operation in 1938, namely:

> An intellectual agreement is an instrument arranged between two or more states with a view to encouraging intellectual relations (artistic, literary, scientific, educational) between their peoples. It extends to one or several fields of intellectual life, without approaching that of political, economic or social relations, which are reserved to other negotiations.

The commission noted that failure to exclude political, economic or social relations had resulted in some of the agreements concluded by totalitarian states becoming instruments for intimidating smaller nations and threatening their independence.

In recommending a form of agreement to which the British Government might become a party, the commission made the following important observations:

> The above outline is influenced by a wish not to seek a "mathematical equivalence" in the obligations imposed by the convention, or rather in the activities organised or fomented by it. A cultural agreement should not be inspired by the idea of getting more than one gives; it is a matter of organising disinterested exchanges, or exchanges equally profitable to both parties. Existing agreements give evidence of the wish of states to spread their own culture abroad and to acquire that of foreign countries, and they are always drawn up on a reciprocal basis. The commission recognises both the generous nature and the advantages of a formula of reciprocity more subtle than the older formulae, and wishes to commend it to future negotiators. The mechanism of a Mixed Commission charged with the execution of the convention will permit (the commission thinks) agreements which are flexible in this respect to be also both feasible and free from risk.

The report of M. Hoste's commission occupies historically an important position in the development of bilateral cultural co-operation. The most primitive view of cultural conventions is that they simply recognise that two governments each wish to conduct cultural propaganda towards one another's populations, and agree to give formal agreement each to the other's activities on lines and in amounts which both find acceptable. Such has remained the inspiration and the pattern of agreements which communist governments negotiate, whether among themselves or with third parties.

CAME sought to raise the level of this horse-trading to a measure of genuine cultural co-operation between peoples. A feature of the CAME-type cultural convention has been the Mixed Commission, composed of representatives of both countries, who jointly review the activities of both governments in the fields covered by the convention, and make joint recommendations to them both. The signatories of the first bilateral conventions to accord with the recommendations of CAME were the signatories of the Brussels Treaty, the importance of which to the future of cultural diplomacy in Europe will be discussed in due course.

9. As early as its fourth meeting, on 25 May 1943, CAME had received a report emanating from an unofficial body known as the London International Assembly. This report the Ministers referred to a committee of three persons, Dr Slavik of Czechoslovakia, M. Hoste of Belgium and Professor Vaucher of France. The committee was instructed, with the help of the secretariat, to prepare a summary of the report for consideration by the conference.

Dr Slavik's committee took a cautious view of the report, in which the London International Assembly had brought together a number of not altogether unfamiliar proposals relating to educational reconstruction, most of which were already under consideration by CAME's commissions. In addition, the report recommended the immediate creation of a "United Nations Bureau for Educational Reconstruction".

The conference had just issued its recommendations on cultural conventions, and took the view that multilateral co-operation should be firmly based on a network of bilateral conventions. The Ministers accordingly considered that a number of the activities which the London International Assembly had recommended could best be realised through the cultural conventions.

The report also proposed the creation of an "International Organisation for Education". In the view of the London International Assembly:

> this should be one of the principal parts of any new international authority that may be created at the end of the war on a world scale or for any group of states. It should be able to draw on the wisdom of government education authorities, teachers, parents' and students' associations, each of which would be represented upon it, and thus be able to combine with the authority of the governments, the active participation of those upon whom will chiefly fall the task of carrying out its decisions.

The functions of the organisation would include the preparation of international agreements fixing minimum educational standards, seeing to their implementation and providing subventions to countries in need of them; the establishment of a bureau of information and research concerned with the methods and organisation of educational systems and the proposal of measures towards education in world citizenship.

Dr Slavik and his colleagues thought this was all going a bit too fast. The proposals were useful, but it would be premature to create an international organisation at this stage. Such an organisation might be expected to emerge eventually from the deliberations of the Ministers; but one must not forget the existing Bureau of Education in Geneva and the Institute of Intellectual Co-operation in Paris, which might be expected to reappear once the war was over.

As for the proposal for the immediate creation of a Bureau for Educational Reconstruction, the Ministers announced their intention to create such a bureau themselves. This led to a reorganisation of CAME's machinery, which thus became a little more formal, but made little material difference to its methods of work. The London International Assembly had also made proposals for the future of education in enemy countries and had proposed a "High Commissioner for Education". Dr Slavik's committee associated itself with some remarks which had recently been made by the President of the conference to the Foreign Press Association:

> When we come to consider education in enemy countries, I prefer not to talk in terms of imposing an educational regime from outside . . .
>
> Let us first teach that war does not pay. Then will come the time for understanding and for tying all the knots of Europe together so that all can learn to take their part in the European community and be worthy and contributory members of the same . . .
>
> It is only in this way that we may hope to make some progress towards what Emmanuel Kant called for – "a long and intensive education of the spirit for all citizens in every country".

Dr Slavik also drew attention to the parallel work and interest in the same subjects of various bodies in the United States and at this stage CAME had become aware of two American plans. The first was that of the "Liaison Committee for International Education" which was adopted by an "Assembly" convened at Harper's Ferry, Virginia, in September 1943 under the presidency of Dr Grayson Kefauver. The second was that of the "United States Committee on Educational Reconstruction" presided over by Mr Stephan Duggan and adopted by an "Institute" meeting at New York in December 1943 under the chairmanship of Professor A. F. Myers. At a slightly later stage, in March 1944, another committee of CAME (consisting of Professor Glaser of Poland, Dr Sommerfelt of Norway and Professer Vaucher of France) compared the three plans. There were striking resemblances and some disparities. Each proposed that the future organisation should become:

1. an organ of reconstruction after the ravages caused by the war;
2. a centre of information and research;
3. a centre for the propagation of an international spirit, since the maintenance of a peace guaranteed by the progress of education was the dominant preoccupation of all the plans;
4. a means of restoring and equalising teaching standards.

As to structure, each plan envisaged an annual conference or "Assembly", a director and a secretariat and a "National Commission" in each member country.

The plans agreed on four other points:

1. aid would be provided only for such countries as wished to receive it; the organisation would not interfere in any government's educational work, nor impose its aid;
2. all countries would participate in complete equality;
3. the choice of delegates would be left to each country, i.e. whether youth movements, parents' and teachers' associations and cultural organisations should be represented;
4. governments would be responsible for the choice of delegates.

10. It was now necessary to consider what steps should be taken to found the new organisation. The London plan suggested that either the President of the United States, or alternatively Mr Butler as President of the Board of Education, should convene a meeting of the four great allied nations, who in their turn would invite the representatives of the other countries to join them, but would themselves take the initiative of convoking a general meeting. The American plans favoured a meeting of all the participants at a diplomatic conference. The New York plan laid the most emphasis on the necessity for beginning the future work in the countries that had suffered most and recommended that the resistance organisations should share in the work from the outset. Both American plans called for a wide propaganda appeal to the public and evinced an anxiety to create first a provisional bureau, governmental in character, and later to erect the new edifice on this initial foundation.

To Professor Glaser's committee the creation of an institution similar to those proposed in the three plans seemed "useful and even necessary". Like Dr Slavik's earlier committee, it also kept in mind the future of the Geneva Bureau and the Institute of Intellectual Co-operation. It seemed natural to the Ministers to associate the work of the two existing institutions with their consideration of plans for the future. They were aware that there was a scheme afoot for re-creating the Institute of Intellectual Co-operation in the United States. Surely an inter-allied Bureau of Education would also be called upon to deal with the wider concept of overall intellectual co-operation.

None of the three plans under review had taken into account the existence of CAME. To the Ministers it seemed clear that the organisation envisaged could only be set up by agreement among governments, and here was an existing intergovernmental conference ready to hand for the consideration of precisely this kind of proposal.

Meanwhile the United States Government had its eye on the proceedings of the conference. An American observer, along with two Russian observers and one from China, had joined the conference for its fourth meeting in May 1943. At its sixth meeting in October of the same year Professor Ralph Turner, a historian from Yale University then working in the Department of State, descended on the conference like a benevolent thunder cloud. He was to be a leading figure in the negotiations that were to follow.

Dr Turner informed the conference that its work was being followed with great interest in the United States. His task in London was to explore the manner in which the United States Government might be able to co-operate in dealing with the problems of educational and cultural reconstruction and rehabilitation. Mainly he would collect information for the Department of State and he might make suggestions and recommendations, but he had no power to commit his government to any particular course of action. The question of setting up a United Nations Bureau was one in which the United States would have a very strong interest.

After his visit of exploration Dr Turner, reasonably satisfied with what he had found, returned to Washington and in March 1944 the United States Secretary of State announced that his government would send a delegation to the ninth meeting of CAME to be held in London on 6 April. On 31 March the Department of State issued a statement of policy on the participation of the United States Government in an international programme for the educational and cultural restoration of countries under enemy occupation in the immediate post-war period. In order to help the devastated countries to help themselves, the department proposed to co-operate for the time being with the conference in London, with the nations represented in this conference and the other allied and associated nations, to bring into existence, as soon as possible, a United Nations Organisation of Educational and Cultural Reconstruction.

The United States delegation was led by a very young Senator, Mr J. William Fulbright, who was soon to obtain world-wide renown by the institution of the Fulbright scholarships. He was accompanied by a powerful team of notabilities. His proposals were divided into two parts. First he wished to discuss the formulation of programmes for the provision of material aids to education, the training of teaching personnel for liberated areas, the restoration of libraries and archives and the revindication of objects of art and cultural property generally. Secondly he wished to discuss the possibility of establishing a United Nations organisation to deal with educational and cultural problems in the period of reconstruction.

Senator Fulbright realised how much the conference had accomplished and he hoped that United States participation would add something to the effectiveness of overall effort. He hoped to take back definite information on the part the United States might play in restoring educational facilities in the occupied countries. This was the first objective of the delegation, but it would also have a long-term effect, in that it would be another step along the road towards security based on collective action.

In the ensuing discussions the French delegates returned to the question of the Institute of Intellectual Co-operation. Perhaps they recognised that its existence, and its location in Paris, could be used as an argument for putting forward Paris as the natural site for the new international organisation.

Professor Cassin said that it would be necessary to study any such pre-war organisations with great care. He felt that it might eventually prove possible for problems of education on the one hand and of intellectual co-operation on the other, though approached from different angles, to be linked under one organisation. Professor Vaucher said that from the brief study so far made, two points had emerged. In the first place there was no danger of there being a lack of interest in the problem: in fact the reverse was the case. In the second place, from the present work of the conference in the field of relief and reconstruction, there should emerge naturally a more precise idea of what the post-war problems would be. It was important for a most precise study of all aspects of the problems to be made, though the stage had not yet been reached for definite conclusions. In the schemes so far studied, two difficulties had been apparent. First, in any future inter-allied organisations what should be the relative parts played by governments on the one hand and by groups interested in educational and intellectual co-operation on the other? Second – the point already raised by Professor Cassin – how far could problems of education and of intellectual co-operation be linked under one authority? The President, Mr Butler, concluded the discussion of these fine points by remarking that he felt it would be damaging if intellectual co-operation were not united with education.

11. For the purpose of discussing the American proposals, the conference adopted the device of holding two "open meetings". This enabled all representatives to participate fully without prejudice to their positions in the conference: that is to say full members and observers equally. Seventeen nations were represented at the first open meeting, at which the American delegation produced the draft of a constitution for the new organisation.

The tentative draft was fully considered and amended and a final version accepted on 19 April. The text was submitted for comment to the governments of forty-four nations.

There followed a long pause. On 13 September 1944 the President, on behalf of the conference, congratulated those governments whose territories had been liberated and those which were in process of liberation. In particular the Chairman of the Executive Bureau, M. Hoste, had already returned to Brussels. From here onwards the disappearance of delegates back to their own countries presented the conference with cumulative difficulties. New voices began to be heard, and their tone was not always quite the same.

It was not until 7 March 1945 that substantial progress could be reported on the draft constitution. Replies were required from twenty nations before further action could be taken. Nearly that number had already expressed concurrence, but by now the situation had evolved and the United Kingdom Government had somewhat modified its views.

It was the view of his government, Mr Butler said, and of several others that the creation of an United Nations Educational Organisation should have the closest possible connection with the San Francisco

Conference. It would therefore be advisable for CAME to have a clear idea of the possible role of an international educational organisation before the San Francisco meeting. The view was held in some quarters that the constitution should be re-drafted on a more permanent basis, and if this proved also to be the view of the San Francisco Conference it would be wise for the Allied Ministers to adhere to that view. He also hoped that during the next month it would be possible to formulate some ideas on possible lines of co-operation with the Institute of Intellectual Co-operation, the Geneva Bureau, and any other similar bodies.

A statement was made on behalf of the United States Government to the effect that the Department of State viewed the formation of an international organisation for educational and cultural development as a matter of great importance. It now felt disposed to support the formation of a permanent international educational and cultural organisation in harmony with the pertinent section respecting specialised organisations which appeared in the Dumbarton Oaks proposals for a general United Nations Organisation. The Department of State believed however that such a step could not be taken until after the San Francisco Conference. It felt that the desirability of linking the educational and cultural organisation with the general organisation was so great that all the United Nations would probably wish to have further information about the larger project before proceeding.

At the San Francisco Conference the United Nations Organisation was established. Article 55 provided for the promotion of international cultural and educational co-operation, while Article 57 provided that the specialised agencies established by intergovernmental agreement and having wide international responsibilities, inter alia, in the social, cultural and educational field should be brought into relationship with the United Nations as "specialised agencies".

The way was now clear for the Allied Ministers to proceed. Acting on their behalf, the United Kingdom Government convened an international conference in London for November 1945. To this conference were presented the proposals of CAME for an educational and cultural organisation of the United Nations, embodied in a draft constitution.

12. The peoples of the world, said the Allied Ministers of Education in their prefatory note to this document, faced unprecedented devastation of educational and cultural resources and facilities by the war. Conditions had been created dangerous to civilisation, and therefore to peace, throughout the whole world. To deprive any part of the interdependent modern world of the cultural resources, human and material, through which its children are trained and its people informed, is to destroy to that extent the common knowledge and the mutual understanding upon which the peace of the world and its security must rest.

The problems of reconstruction in the educational and cultural field which grew out of the war would naturally be among the chief concerns of the international organisation during the first years of its existence. These problems were not specifically referred to in the constitution, partly because of the permanent character of the organisation contemplated and partly because of uncertainty at that time of the methods that would be used in economic and social reconstruction and the procedures which the new organisation and the member governments would find it practicable and wise to adopt.

In the draft constitution provision was made for the establishment of "an Educational and Cultural Organisation of the United Nations". The inclusion of the word "scientific" in the title was yet to come, though scientists attached to the Allied Ministers had been pressing for this without, so far, gaining their cause.

At the London Conference of November 1945 fourty-four nations were represented and agreed upon a modified version of the draft which CAME had presented to them. In particular the preamble was re-worded with greater eloquence. It was at this stage that the phrase was adopted: "Since wars begin in the minds of men, it is in the minds of men that the defences of peace must be constructed."

Thus, at the London Conference held within a few months of the end of hostilities in the second world war, the Statute of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation was adopted. It was agreed that "The purpose of the organisation is to contribute to peace and security by promoting collaboration among the nations through education, science and culture in order to further universal respect for justice, for the rule of law and for human rights and fundamental freedoms which are affirmed for the peoples of the world, without distinction of race, sex, language or religion, by the Charter of the United Nations."

In 1946 Unesco was formally established at a conference held in Paris, which city was thereupon chosen as its permanent home.

With the activities and the growth of Unesco, this book is not concerned. It is a world-wide organisation, which seems now to be well on the way to becoming a kind of Ministry of Education for the world, whereby the resources of all nations are pooled and those which have need of help in the development of their educational policies are able to draw upon the resources of those which have help to give. It does, it is true, have regional programmes; but the European region of Unesco includes the communist as well as the non-communist countries of Europe, and it is the cultural diplomacy of the non-communist countries of Europe which forms the subject-matter of this book. From this point onwards, Unesco will be regarded simply as a part of the scenery before which the action develops. How this particular piece of scenery was assembled and put into position by CAME has just been described.

On 5 December 1945, in the month following the London Conference, CAME held its final meeting, and dispersed. Unesco inherited its archives. Its prescription for the form of bilateral cultural conventions soon began to be adopted; and not many years were to pass before its example of multilateral, or collective, cultural diplomacy began to be followed among the European nations. Before examining in detail the post-war manifestations in Europe of collective cultural diplomacy, let us look at the evolution of the cultural policies of France, Italy, the Federal German Republic and the United Kingdom.

Note to Chapter II

* Texts are quoted from Seymour.

PART II

NATIONAL ATTITUDES

III.

FRANCE

1. No sooner were they freed from enemy occupation than the French set methodically about rebuilding their system of cultural diplomacy. The collapse of 1940, the years of occupation, the military operations of 1944-45 had left a need for total political and economic reconstruction. In these conditions it would not have been surprising if cultural diplomacy had suffered a temporary eclipse. But the French authorities saw that with the rebuilding of the French economy, with the reassertion of French political authority, must go the re-establishment of France's prestige in the world. Cultural diplomacy must be pursued with greater vigour and greater efficiency than ever before.

Within France, the Vichy Administration of 1940-44 had made a rather subdued use of the machinery of cultural diplomacy which, as we saw in the first chapter, had already been created before the war. French representatives had however been prominent in the activities, described in the preceding chapter, of the Conference of Allied Ministers of Education which met in London from 1942-45. Within a few weeks of the liberation of Paris in the summer of 1944, thought was being given to the need to get French cultural diplomacy on the move again. How this was achieved is described comprehensively and in detail in Annie Angremy's study *La diplomatie culturelle de la France.*

The first step was to set up a satisfactory organisation at the centre. In 1920, after the first world war, the *Bureau des écoles et des oeuvres,* created in 1900 in the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, had been upgraded to a *Service des oeuvres françaises à l'étranger.* But this upgraded structure had remained a part of the Political and Commercial Directorate of the Ministry. Now in 1945 recognition was given to the enhanced importance of cultural diplomacy by the creation, at the Quai d'Orsay, of a *Direction générale des relations culturelles,* separate from the political and economic directorates.

The first Director-General of Cultural Relations was Professor Henri Laugier, of the *Faculté des sciences de Paris,* a man of great academic eminence and a pioneer of intellectual co-operation. He was assisted by a staff drawn partly from diplomacy and partly from the universities. With a budget of some 460 million francs (about 36 % of the total budget of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs)[1] Professor Laugier embarked upon a task which at first consisted of co-ordinating those elements of government departments and private institutions within France which could make a contribution to French cultural diplomacy, providing subsidies where appropriate; and building up a network of cultural counsellors and cultural attachés at French diplomatic missions abroad.

To Professor Laugier's successor as Director-General, M. Louis Joxe, a diplomat later to become a Cabinet Minister, a greater responsibility was entrusted when, in 1946, the Ministry of Information was abolished and the Information Services transferred to the Secretariat of State of the *Présidence du Conseil* (Prime Minister's Office). The Directorate-General of Cultural Affairs inherited a part of the Ministry of Information's budget, and also acquired from the Ministry of Education its *Bureau d'action artistique*. M. Joxe was required to organise a regrouping of the services charged with French cultural relations abroad and French information abroad. In 1947 the Bureau entrusted with relations with Unesco was attached to M. Joxe, and in the following year he assumed responsibility for France's information services abroad, as well as her cultural diplomacy. Centralisation within the Ministry of Foreign Affairs had thus been taken a stage further.

Thus, immediately after the second world war, the French Government created, and in the next few years rapidly developed, a highly-centralised base organisation from which to conduct its cultural diplomacy. The Directorate-General of Cultural Relations, centred in the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, could draw on the support of other government departments (in particular the Ministry of Education) and of non-governmental organisations; it could subsidise the operations of the private sector; and, through a network of committees, it could ensure the co-ordination of a variety of activities necessary to its plans, and secure the contribution of experts of the highest quality in the process both of planning and of execution.

This machinery was employed, first and foremost, in the task of re-establishing the status of the French language in a world which, during the war, had been denied most of its opportunities of refreshing itself at the springs by which alone the vigour of that language could be maintained.

The first task was not only to breathe new life into French institutions of education in foreign lands, but to reconsider their methods of operation and bring them into harmony with the needs of the post-war world. French *lycées* abroad had in many instances been created primarily for the purpose of providing a French education for the children of French parents working outside their own country. The drawing-power of the French language, and indeed of French education, had attracted pupils of the country in which they were situated, where a limited number of parents saw advantage in giving their children a French education in spite of the disadvantages of taking them out of the educational system of their own country.

Now it was seen that the attraction of these *lycées* for non-French pupils would be increased if the curriculum could be so organised as to fit into the national educational system as well as providing a grounding in the French language and French civilisation. This new policy soon proved to be a success: by 1951, the *lycée* in Brussels numbered more than 100 non-French pupils out of a total of 300; the *lycée* in Rome 157 Italian pupils out of 353; of the 1 200 pupils in the *lycée* in London, more than half were English. Of two *lycées* created after the war, that in Saarbrücken numbered 500 Saarlanders among its 1 000 pupils, and that in Vienna 522 Austrians out of a total of 712.

The primary purpose of French *lycées* abroad was thus no longer to provide an education for French children, though this continued to be their secondary objective, and incidentally a necessary part of their new primary objective, which had now become to impart a knowledge of the French language and of French civilisation to non-French children. This in itself was part of a larger plan: to encourage the teaching of French in foreign schools and universities. With this aim in view, the *instituts francais* already established in numerous countries were likewise required to adapt themselves to the system of higher education of the countries in which they were situated, and make their contribution to an improvement of the quality of French studies in the universities of those countries. For this purpose a number of new *instituts français* were founded in Europe, the Middle East and Latin America: no time was lost, for two of these came into existence in 1945, four in 1946, four in 1947 and one in 1948. In addition, cultural centres were opened in several countries, designed to appeal to a more varied *clientèle* than the university-level *instituts*.

Meanwhile the French archaeological institutes in foreign countries were coming to life once more, and in 1947 a Research Commission was set up, run by the Directorate-General of Cultural Relations, to prepare a programme of archaeological research abroad, to appoint the heads of French archaeological missions, and to follow their activity and their publications.

In 1945 a reception committee for foreign students was set up in the Ministry of Education. Six hundred scholarships were offered in the following year, of which two thirds were reserved for scholars from countries liberated from German occupation. At this stage it was recognised that one of the future objectives of French cultural diplomacy would be the training of foreign teachers who, on returning to their own countries, would pass on to their compatriots the French education which they had received – an objective described in the meaningful shorthand phrase *formation de cadres*.

In December 1944 the *Alliance française* reopened its Practical School of French Language. In the first month (the war was not yet won) only 24 pupils enrolled: the total for 1945 was 1 200.

2. An adaptation of French establishments of learning in foreign countries to post-war requirements, an increase in their number, and the despatch to them of lecturers and teachers was immediately seen to be only a part of the operation needed to reinvigorate the status of the French language in the world. It was essential to ensure that this work was supported by an adequate supply of French books and periodicals.

On the morrow of France's liberation, the situation was discouraging. The libraries of French institutes and schools had been in part destroyed or pillaged. Destruction and loss had to be made good. The stock of French books in foreign libraries was depleted and far from up to date. The French-reading foreign public had little opportunity of obtaining information about French book production. This, moreover, was inadequate even to supply the home market. The paper shortage drastically limited the size of new editions, and made the re-printing of classical authors or of textbooks impossible. In addition, there were massive problems of transport and of payment across the exchanges. Enquiries and requests began to flow in from numerous countries.

In the spring of 1945 the Directorate-General of Cultural Relations set up a committee to examine the needs and make recommendations. This committee, and a non-governmental Association for the Diffusion of French Thought, worked together to put matters to rights. A number of French classics were soon reprinted in cheap editions and distributed to French educational institutions abroad. A monthly review giving selected extracts from French literary and scientific works was circulated through the agency of foreign librarians as well as by French cultural attachés. Another monthly publication, a critical bulletin, prepared by specialists with foreign universities in mind, gave bibliographical notices of new publications in all fields of learning: it soon established a readership of 4 000, and served as a guide to foreign universities in the purchase of French books.

During the years 1945 and 1946, when transport was precarious and the book trade had still to be re-established, 200 000 volumes were despatched by the Directorate-General of Cultural Relations to French diplomatic missions abroad to be passed on to libraries, both French and foreign. By 1947 a system had been organised whereby French cultural attachés were able to keep these libraries informed of availabilities, and to channel their requests to Paris, enabling the organisers to make out an inventory of requirements and establish a system of priorities.

One of the elements of this operation was the choice of some thirty new titles a month for despatch to seventy recipients, who were required to exhibit them in reading-rooms and bookshop windows.

Supplemented by press and radio publicity, this initiative enjoyed a marked success, and soon became a recognised method of promoting the sale of French books abroad.

Simultaneously, a number of French periodicals, largely scientific and technical, were distributed to selected recipients in foreign countries. Half a million copies were thus circulated in 1947 and 1948: the free distribution was a publicity venture which led to a substantial number of commercial orders.

In 1945 and 1946, the Directorate-General, through its cultural attachés, organised a number of exhibitions of French books in numerous countries. Some of these covered French book production as a whole, others were specialised. From 1947 onwards the book trade took over these exhibitions, which thenceforward became a commercial venture. In the early stages, help was given by the Directorate-General to overcome the problems of currency transfers.

In 1948, the government set up a National Commission for French Books Abroad, with a membership of distinguished political, literary and scientific personalities. The commission worked for a year, and produced reports on numerous aspects of the export of French books. Thereafter the subject became the province of a Permanent Committee for French Books Abroad, working out a policy established by a Higher Council for French Books Abroad, both operating in conjunction with the Ministries of Foreign Affairs, Education and Foreign Trade. Thus the French book trade was able to export within the framework of a policy designed to facilitate commerce and at the same time enhance prestige.

Meanwhile the despatch of lecturers, practised on a large scale between the wars, was resumed by the *Alliance française* before the war had even come to an end. But soon the Directorate-General of Cultural Relations realised that a change of policy was required. The despatch by the *Alliance française* of distinguished lecturers who chose their own subjects and their own destinations was seen to be something of a luxury. What was now found more rewarding was to discover where the demand existed for French lecturers, and in what subjects. Specialists were then sought who would give the required lectures in the places which wanted them.

This measure of professionalisation was enhanced by the despatch of cultural missions of scientific or technical specialists, who would go where there was a demand for their services, and would stay long enough to make a real impact in places where it had been discovered in advance that such missions would be welcomed and heeded.

The impact on foreign *clientèles* of French teaching, French books and periodicals, French specialist lecture missions was reinforced by the French radio, which had emerged from the occupation with all its short-wave transmitters destroyed by the operations of war. By the end of 1944, five short-wave transmitters had been brought into operation; and in 1945 broadcasting became a state monopoly. In 1946 a service of international radio exchanges was created, and operated in concert with the Directorate-General of Cultural Relations. In 1949 this exchange service broadcast 5 000 transmissions to twenty countries: in 1957, the numbers had risen to 9 463 transmissions to sixty-five foreign countries and seven French overseas territories. The service also received some 3 000 transmissions from abroad, which were rebroadcast in France. From 1949 onwards French lessons began to be broadcast to recipients in countries of English, Portuguese, Polish, German, Spanish and Arabic speech.

The international film festival of Cannes was inaugurated in 1946, and 1948 saw the beginning of the despatch of French cultural documentary films abroad: 700 such documentaries were sent out in the first half of 1949; in the first half of 1950 the number was 1 400. Co-operation was established between the Directorate-General and the film industry, and it now became possible to organise French film weeks abroad at which examples of the best of French film production could be shown.

From 1946 onwards the Directorate-General of Cultural Relations began a fruitful co-operation with an organisation which had existed since 1922 under the name of French Association for Artistic Action Abroad. This co-operation resulted in the despatch of a number of French theatrical companies of the highest quality on foreign tours; in tours of orchestras, concert-groups and individual players; and in a substantial despatch to foreign countries of French art exhibitions, often on a reciprocal basis in the context of the bilateral cultural conventions.

By 1956, the Directorate-General of Cultural Relations had greatly augmented the quantity, diversified the nature, and enhanced the quality of French cultural operations abroad. More and more now it was directing its activities to former French colonies, for the French Government was quick to recognise that decolonisation offered new and politically-rewarding opportunities to the exercise of cultural diplomacy. Meanwhile development aid was also becoming a leading preoccupation of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. Here was an opportunity of greater co-ordination and concentration at the centre. In 1956 the *Direction générale des relations culturelles* was converted into the *Direction générale des affaires culturelles et techniques*.

3. The Department of Technical Co-operation, which was now incorporated in the Directorate-General for Cultural and Technical

Affairs, brought together the responsibilities for international technical co-operation previously exercised by a variety of departments in a number of different directorates.

> Such a reorganisation was needed, if a single directing intelligence was to preside over both the planning and the execution of the various programmes of technical assistance and of cultural action correctly designated. Our almost world-wide cultural presence indeed offers immeasurable possibilities of action for this new form of international collaboration and of peaceful penetration. It was impossible not to think of drawing advantage from the favourable conditions created for our benefit by the experience of a long tradition and the accumulated sympathies procured by our disinterested actions of the past and by the efforts of the *Alliance française.* [3]

The transition from the concept of technical assistance to that of technical co-operation, and the concentration of this range of activities within the Directorate-General of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs whose mission up to that time had been the co-ordination and invigoration of French cultural diplomacy, was the administrative preparation for a new phase of cultural policy. In 1957 a committee of senior officials was given the task of drawing up a five-year programme for the expansion and reconversion of French cultural and technical activities abroad. The government approved this five-year plan in 1958, and made available the financial resources needed for its implementation.

Two years after the approval of this five-year programme, a five-year plan of technical co-operation was worked out for the Directorate-General's Department of Technical Co-operation. This department was already, in 1960, spending a quarter of the total budget of the new Directorate-General for Cultural and Technical Affairs.

Then in 1964 a second five-year plan of cultural expansion was adopted. At the end of this quinquennium, in 1969, the Directorate-General was further expanded, and became the Directorate-General for Cultural, Scientific and Technical Relations.

It may be convenient at this stage to set out the phases of expansion of the infrastructure within the Ministry of Foreign Affairs through which French cultural diplomacy has been directed since the war:

1945: Creation of the *Direction générale des relations culturelles.*
1946: Incorporation into the above of the Ministry of Education's *Bureau d'action artistique.*

1947: Absorption of the bureau responsible for relations with Unesco, and subsequently with all intergovernmental organisations concerned with cultural co-operation.

1948: Absorption of the *Service d'information et de presse à l'étranger.*

1954-56: Cultural activities in Morocco, Tunisia and the former states of Indochina.

1956: Creation of the Department of Technical Co-operation within a new *Direction générale des affaires culturelles et techniques.*

1966: Department of Technical Co-operation of the Directorate-General upgraded into an independent *Direction de la co-opération technique.* Extends its functions to Algeria (formerly the responsibility of the Secretariat of State for Algerian Affairs). Ministry of Co-operation, for black Africa and Madagascar, created in 1960, becomes a Secretariat of State in the Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

1969: Creation of the Department of Scientific Affairs. The Directorate-General now becomes the *Direction générale des relations culturelles, scientifiques et techniques.*

Though containing the initiating and co-ordinating structure of French cultural diplomacy within its establishment, the Ministry for Foreign Affairs is nevertheless dependent upon the co-operation of other government departments, to say nothing of the non-governmental organisations (e.g. *Alliance française, Mission laique française)* which work in the same field. Most important among these is the Ministry of Education, whose principal task in this context is the recruitment of teaching personnel for secondment abroad, and the career interests of these teachers, including their reabsorption on return to France. Many dependencies of the Ministry of Education are also actively engaged in the training of French teachers who are to serve abroad and of foreign teachers of French, and in carrying out research into educational problems arising in this context, not least of these being the techniques of teaching French to foreigners. The Ministry of Education also shares with the Ministry of Foreign Affairs in providing delegates to the meetings of international organisations, and looks after French participation in the Conference of European Ministers of Education of African countries and of Madagascar.

The Secretariat of State for Youth and Sport also works closely with the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, as does the Ministry of Cultural Affairs. And the ORTF *(Office de la radiodiffusion télévision française)* provides a world-wide service of cultural transmissions at the request and expense of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

4. Like its predecessor the Directorate-General of Cultural Relations, the new Directorate-General for Cultural and Technical Affairs gave highest priority to the expansion of the French language throughout the world. In the words of the first five-year programme:

> There is no need to show that is not for us simply a question of prestige. Language is an essential means of propagating

> knowledge and ideas. Its spread is the condition among foreigners of the success of other forms of cultural and technical action. It is therefore vital to follow up the effort undertaken for many years to defend the French language in the world.

There have long been countries (Canada, Belgium, Luxembourg, Switzerland, Haiti) where a part of the population is French-speaking. The process of decolonisation has added a number of independent nations where French remains the national tongue, or the official tongue, or sometimes the language of education. It has been French policy to remain the recognised linguistic centre of the 180 million or so French speakers in thirty-two countries, twenty-four of which have French as their official language.

> To these vast populations, the French language provides not only all the wealth of an incomparable instrument of culture, but it also constitutes a valuable factor of cohesion transcending the compartmentalisation of dialects, and an opening on to the world, a means of communicating with the concert of nations which compose the international community. In this sense French has become a language of the masses, which it never was half a century ago.[3]

During the Presidency of de Gaulle, France found herself with a head of state who was not only a vigorous defender but also an outstanding practitioner of the French language. Under his inspiration, the policy of expanding the extent and simultaneously maintaining the quality of French teaching throughout the French-speaking world (and beyond) achieved a remarkable success. At the United Nations, one delegation out of three now uses the French language. And the quality of published books written in French by writers not of French nationality argues the excellence of French teaching in the French-speaking world. The Niamey Conference of 1969 brought together thirty-three delegations who adopted the principle of a French-speaking agency of co-operation. A second conference, meeting again at Niamey in 1970, decided definitely to create this agency, and to locate it in Paris. France agreed to meet 45 % of the costs of this new form of multilateral linguistic co-operation.

The creation in 1966 of the *Haut Comité pour la défense et l'expansion de la langue française,* bringing together leading personages from the world of letters, higher education, science, representatives of the *Alliance française* and the *Amitiés catholiques françaises* under the chairmanship of the Prime Minister, served to mark the importance accorded by the French Government to the protection of the French language and the promotion of French teaching throughout the world.

Language is, however, only the starting-point of the operation. Next comes the diffusion of French culture, literary and artistic. As the first five-year programme put it:

> Our intellectual influence in the world is founded primarily upon the fact that for many countries, often distant countries, we remain the nation of humanism and one of the centres of Western civilisation. Just as it would be unwise to be satisfied with this traditional view of France, so we should be blameworthy if we allowed our image to become damaged or grow dim.

Thus to the dissemination of the literary and artistic heritage of France, and of her modern achievements in this field, must be added a conscious effort to establish a world-wide reputation for French as a language providing the key to scientific and technical knowledge. In 1965 the *Académie des sciences* adopted a resolution asking the state to intervene powerfully with a view to securing for the French language, at meetings convened by international organisations, a proper respect in scientific matters. The President of the Republic hastened to reply that he entirely shared this desire, adding that it was in the national interest that men of learning and technicians should be inspired, in the use of the French language, by the respect which science owes to itself – a reminder that to write good French is as much an obligation upon men of science as it is upon men of letters.

Let us now examine the application to French cultural diplomacy of the new concepts of linguistic, cultural and technical co-operation.

5. The report for 1950 of the *Direction générale des affaires culturelles et techniques* tells us that France's activities in the field of cultural diplomacy

> are divided into two large sectors which closely complement one another: on the one hand the task is to educate *(former)* the foreign public, in particular the young, in the use of our language, in our disciplines of thought, in our methods of work and on the other hand to make it easy for this public, once it has been so prepared, and for wider sections of the population, which can henceforward be reached by modern methods of dissemination, to have access to France's cultural heritage, understood in the widest sense. The first sector falls within the competence of the Departments of Teaching, of Technical Co-operation and that of the Bureau of Scholarships; the second, within the competence of the Departments of Cultural Exchanges and of Artistic Exchanges.

The application of these concepts naturally varies with the countries to which they are applied. In countries with a cultural level comparable with that of France, cultural diplomacy is employed to provide a French complement to national institutions. In the countries of Africa and Asia formerly part of the French Empire, the task has been first to provide a basic education, and thence to move gently towards genuine co-operation.

"Teaching is the very basis of our efforts of cultural expansion in all fields."[4] The principle is supported by the practice. For if in 1956, when the *Direction générale des relations culturelles* became the *Direction générale des affaires culturelles et techniques*, the number of French teachers seconded for duty abroad was about 15 000 (more than five-sixths of them in Tunisia and Morocco), by 1967 the number had risen to more than 34 000, nearly 30 000 of them in African countries.

While the great majority of seconded French teachers are placed at the disposal of foreign governments, a substantial number exercise their profession in French institutions abroad. In 1967 there were, in foreign countries, 131 *lycées* in which more than 2 000 French teachers educated an intellectual élite of close on 98 000 pupils. Another 6 800 French teachers were employed in some 1 000 other establishments of secondary education abroad, the great majority of them in Algeria, Morocco and Tunisia. Altogether 680 000 children abroad were being taught in French, by French teachers, by French teaching methods, and sometimes following French curricula.

In addition, more than 98 000 persons were members of 59 *instituts français*, and some 93 000 were enrolled in 160 French cultural centres.

This great quantitative impact was strongly reinforced qualitatively by a number of research organisations within France, concerned with teaching methods, with the special educational problems of developing countries, with the techniques of teaching French civilisation, and above all with the specialised task of teaching French as a foreign language. Since 1961 French teachers abroad and foreign teachers of French have been kept abreast of the findings of these research organisations by means of a review entitled *Le français dans le monde*. A *Bureau pédagogique*, created within the Directorate-General in 1965, has given special attention to teacher-training among foreign teachers of French by means of specially designed courses employing the most up-to-date audio-visual methods.

The French *lycée* in foreign countries has progressively become a Franco-foreign educational institution for educational élites, including a substantial, but frequently minority, proportion of French pupils. Its aim is to educate a bilingual élite, who shall not be intellectually de-nationalised, but shall combine a national education in the language and civilisation of the country in which it operates with an access through the French language to the world-wide values of French civilisation.

This new policy, combined with the first-class teaching equipment supplied to them, has made of French *lycées* in foreign countries a much-valued starting-point for the teacher-training of future non-French teachers of French: in other words, for the *formation des cadres*.

The basic teacher-training furnished by French *lycées* is carried to a higher level in the *instituts français,* which are each under the patronage of a French university, but are now integrated as far as possible into the systems of higher education of the country in which they are situated. The *instituts* provide research and training centres for foreign teachers of French, of whom there are more than 450 000. A noteworthy example of the ready acceptance of this policy by the host country has been afforded in Italy, where since 1960 the training of Italian teachers of French has been officially entrusted to the *instituts français,* which prepare these future teachers for the Italian *Abilitazione* examination.

Mention was made in the first chapter of the opening of French schools of archaeology in Athens and Rome. The number of such French institutions of archaeological research in foreign countries has now greatly increased. Here there has been no need to adapt policy to modern requirements: the original conception has proved its value. All that was needed was an evolution in the direction of closer co-operation with the local authorities, and the introduction of more modern techniques, combined with an overall planning of research, and better co-ordinated publication of results.

The contribution of non-governmental organisations to the aims of French cultural policy has already been mentioned. In 1967 a statistical enquiry showed how great a part was being played by the *Alliance française.* It was found to have 1 200 committees scattered throughout the world, whose pre-war cultural activity was transformed progressively into French teaching. Latin America remained its principal target area, where 1 650 out of its total of 2 465 teachers taught 100 000 out of its total of 185 000 pupils. 33 000 foreigners, of some 120 nationalities, were enrolled as pupils of the Practical School of French Language which, as we saw at the end of the first section of this chapter, had been re-opened by the *Alliance française* with a mere 24 pupils in December 1944.

The *Mission laïque française,* for its part, saw its teaching establishments nationalised in Egypt, North Vietnam and Syria. But it retained control of establishments in Ethiopia, Lebanon, Iran, Greece and Afghanistan which catered altogether for 10 000 pupils. In 1966 it opened a new *lycée* in Teheran.

French Catholic teaching missionaries are no longer as numerous as they were earlier in this century: but in 1966 there were still some 10 000 of them working in widely-scattered establisments numbering 3 500 000 pupils. Problems of recruitment are looked after by the *Comité catholique des amitiés françaises dans le monde.* In Lebanon a Jesuit foundation, the St Joseph University, has been in existence since 1881 and has added many new faculties during the present century.

The only French Protestant teaching establishment abroad is also in the Lebanon at Beirut. It is a girls' college, founded in 1927: there are 20 seconded French teachers among its staff of 111, and it prepares nearly 1 500 pupils for the French and Lebanese *baccalauréats.*

During the early post-war years it was not possible – partly through lack of funds, partly for want of candidates – to meet the demand of foreign governments for French teachers. But by 1958 the recruitment of French teachers for foreign teaching institutions had reached 8 500, and by 1968 it was close on 21 000. Like teachers seconded to French teaching establishments abroad, these teachers are recalled after six years, so that the corps of teachers abroad shall periodically be renewed by new arrivals from France itself.

The official recognition by the Italian Government of the *instituts français* as the training establishments of Italian teachers of French has already been mentioned. An even more significant measure of co-operation between France and Germany was initiated in 1960, and conventionalised in the Franco-German Treaty of Co-operation of 1963. A number of *instituts français* in Germany have become Franco-German establishments, playing their part in the training of Germans to increase the output of French teaching in the Federal Republic.

6. A measure of technical assistance was included in French cultural diplomacy from the earliest days – the management of hospitals and the despatch of medical personnel to the Far East. The French played their part from the beginning in the post-war efforts of the United Nations and of other specialised agencies to promote the progress of the developing countries by means of international co-operation; and were active participants from the earliest stages in the United Nations expanded programme of technical assistance. With the emergence of French colonies to independence, special efforts were made to intensify such aid. It seemed natural to entrust this activity also to the Directorate-General of Cultural Relations and to reorganise it in 1956, as we have seen, into a Directorate-General for Cultural and Technical Affairs.

While matters closely related to economic and commercial expansion were handled by the Ministry of Finance and Economic Affairs, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, through its Directorate-General for Cultural and Technical Affairs, took charge of the so-called non-economic measures of technical assistance, namely public administration, agriculture, architecture and town-planning, public health, social affairs. Co-ordination between the two ministries was organised through a Higher Council of Technical Co-operation.

Technical co-operation, as practised by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, is carried out by two complementary methods. The first is the despatch of French experts and technicians to the developing countries on missions of varying duration; the second, the training of personnel from the developing countries. French experts and technicians thus sent abroad numbered 5 000 in 1960, and 7 000 in 1966: the largest part of them went to former French dependencies in North Africa. Training of foreign personnel was carried out either in France, or by French experts in the developing countries: in general it has been found more productive to train those destined for leadership in France, and those likely to assume subordinate posts in their own country.

The reception and welfare of foreign students seeking to complete their education in France has been one of the continuing, and growing, concerns of the Directorate-General. From a total of 15 000 in 1958, the number had grown to some 40 000 ten years later. A third or more have been the recipients of French government scholarships: the others have come at their own expense or at the expense of their governments or of international organisations. The earlier practice of granting scholarships to an intellectual élite seeking a university education, and coming mainly from other countries of a high educational level, has slowly given way to a new policy of attracting promising students from developing countries in search of technical training. Thus in 1967 scholarships for university education were given to 6 000 students, whereas more than 9 000 received technical training scholarships. The Directorate-General and the Ministry of Education cooperate to handle selection, reception and accommodation; and in many instances the students are given accelerated courses of French language teaching, using modern audio-visual techniques, sometimes in their country of origin, sometimes on arrival in France.

A highly-developed aspect of French cultural diplomacy is the organisation of cultural and scientific interchange. The Directorate-General has been at pains to ensure that France is effectively represented at international meetings, literary, scientific, specialist. An effort is made to supplement French representation at such conferences or congresses by follow-up missions of qualified persons. The counterpart of this activity is the giving of practical help for the holding of international conferences or congresses in France, and the reception of foreign specialists coming to France, and help to enable them to establish contact with their French opposite numbers.

Another form of international interchange highly organised in France is that of young persons, particularly representatives of youth organisations. Within this sphere of activity a particularly active element is the Franco-German Youth Office, which has existed since 1963 and plays its part in the meeting annually of some 300 000 young people from the two countries.

Mention was made earlier of the efforts undertaken immediately after the war to ensure that French books should once again become readily available abroad. This important aspect of French cultural diplomacy has been progressively developed by carefully-planned co-operation between government agencies and the book trade. French libraries abroad have been greatly increased in number, and more than 400 000 volumes are now sent out every year to keep them up to date. These book despatches are supplemented by the supply of periodicals, specialised publications, photographs and exhibitions.

The more modern media of mass communication, film, radio, records, television are being more and more widely employed as a part of the techniques of French cultural diplomacy, both in language-teaching and in cultural dissemination. Theatre, opera, ballet, music continue to be extensively used, to a large extent reciprocally under bilateral agreements. Exchanges of whatever kind with communist countries need to be handled by special techniques: these are organised by a Bureau of cultural exchanges with Eastern European countries, the Soviet Union and China.

7. In the first part of this book, credit was given to France for having introduced into the world the techniques of cultural diplomacy – both the more nationalistic practice of cultural propaganda, and the less selfish development of bilateral cultural co-operation. The present chapter has, up to this moment, been concerned with the evolution within France since the second world war of both the singular and the dual aspects of cultural diplomacy, which have remained the essential elements – in France as in other countries – of governmental action in the field of international cultural relations.

It was suggested in Part I that the third, or collective, aspect of cultural diplomacy arose out of the exceptional conditions which obtained in the United Kingdom during the 1939-45 war. In spite of her unhappy wartime situation, France was able to play a prominent part in the deliberations of the Conference of Allied Ministers of Education, and in the creation of Unesco. And it was altogether fitting that Unesco should have found its permanent home in Paris for, among other justifications, it was the French who had taken the lead in creating Unesco's precursor in the years between the two wars.

In 1921 Léon Bourgeois made a proposal, which was accepted by the Council of the League of Nations, for the creation of a commission to study international questions of intellectual co-operation and education. Out of this initiative, and with financial and administrative help from the French Government, grew the Paris-based Institute of Intellectual Co-operation. As seen in the light of collective cultural co-operation as now practised (which will be described in Part III), the achievements of this institute may seem rather jejune. But France had led the way, and was to develop, when Unesco had come into being in 1946 with its headquarters in Paris, a highly efficient administrative technique of planning and co-ordinating the activities of French delegations both to Unesco itself, and to the other international organisations which were subsequently to develop programmes of cultural co-operation — the Brussels Treaty Organisation/Western European Union, the North Atlantic Treaty Organisation, the South-East Asia Treaty Organisation, the Organisation for European Economic Co-operation (later the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development) and above all the Council of Europe.

Mention has been made above of technical co-operation and of scientific co-operation carried out on a bilateral basis. Similar co-operation on a multilateral basis is carried out by a number of international organisations, and in these collective activities France has from the beginning played an active, often a leading, part. But here, as in collective cultural co-operation, the new multilateral techniques have absorbed only a small part of the effort put into analogous activities carried out bilaterally.

We saw in Part I that, by the outbreak of the second world war, the French Government had concluded nineteen agreements of a cultural nature with thirteen foreign governments. The work of the Conference of Allied Ministers of Education during the war gave a new meaning to the concept of bilateral cultural conventions: and between 1945 and 1970 the French Government concluded agreements, conventions or protocols of cultural, technical or scientific co-operation with no less than eighty governments.

Condensed though the foregoing account of French cultural diplomacy is, it should have become clear from it that in France the concept of spreading a knowledge of the French language and of projecting an image of French civilisation has been pursued with a confidence of purpose unhampered by doubts of the value of such a policy; that this confidence of purpose has been reflected in the constant adaptation of administrative patterns to enable the policy to be effectively carried out; and that the techniques of cultural diplomacy have evolved so as to take heed of changing requirements and expanding possibilities.

By 1970, nearly two thirds of the budget of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs was allocated to the Directorate-General for Cultural, Scientific and Technical Relations. Taking into consideration certain credits placed, for technical reasons, under other headings and France's contribution to international organisations with programmes of cultural, technical or scientific co-operation,

> nearly three quarters of the credits earmarked for France's foreign relations are devoted to what we can call modern diplomacy . . . And it is a diplomacy of direct action, since more than 40 000 persons in all make up this peaceful army, comprising 30 000 teachers and 10 000 experts in specialities other than that of teaching.[5]

Having been ruthlessly condensed in the foregoing pages, Annie Angremy shall be allowed to pronounce the concluding words herself.

From the era of schools to that of international scientific co-operation, such is the profile of French cultural diplomacy. It has emerged progressively from short-term undertakings, from the mere transference abroad of national actions or institutions, to arrive finally at a system of co-operation genuinely concerted with its partners. It has extended its geographical horizon to all the corners of the world and, without renouncing the traditions of its past, it has embraced the problems of its time and little by little enveloped in a coherent overall programme the overriding themes of the world of today. The working out of this programme implies neither autocratic dogmatism, nor dispersion of means, but a global policy, comprising specific functions and knowing how to determine the necessary choices and priorities.[6]

Notes to Chapter III

1. McMurry and Lee: p. 24.

2. Quoted by Angremy, p. 67, from the **Rapport d'activité, 1957, of the Direction générale des affaires culturelles et techniques.**

3. Quoted by Angremy, pp. 70-71, from **L'action culturelle de la France dans le monde,** 1963, by Jean Basdevant, Director-General of Cultural and Technical Affairs.

4. Quoted by Angremy, p. 98, from **"La politique culturelle de la France"** by Jean Basdevant, in **Revue de la Défense nationale,** February 1962.

5. Quoted by Angremy, in her introduction, from a speech of 12 December 1969 by Pierre Laurent, Director-General of Cultural, Scientific and Technical Affairs, entitled **"Les lignes directrices de l'action culturelle, scientifique et technique de la France dans le monde".**

6. Angremy, p. 184.

IV.

ITALY

1. Unlike the United Kingdom and France, Italy does not possess a language used for international communication throughout the world. Nor, for that matter, does Germany: but German is more in demand as a language of study by foreigners than is Italian. On the other hand the emigration of Italians in search of work elsewhere in the world has led to the existence of considerable populations of Italian descent in many countries of Latin America, and less importantly in other countries as well; and there is at present a substantial amount of Italian labour, largely seasonally migrant labour, in other European countries.

There is therefore a substantial demand from Italians, and from the descendants of Italians, for educational facilities in the Italian language in many countries of the world, and for cultural links with the Italian homeland. And if fewer foreigners wish to learn Italian than English, French or German, Italian art, sculpture, architecture, opera, music and – more recently – films enjoy a prestige in much of the world which affords ample opportunities for the exercise of Italian cultural diplomacy.

At the end of the second world war Italy had to live down a history of some twenty years of fascism, and needed to build up her prestige from a minus quantity. Evidence that this was widely felt in Italy is provided by the creation in 1944 – when the Italians were fighting with their former enemies against their former partners – of a non-governmental society known as the Italian Society for International Organisation (SIOI) aimed at encouraging the development of an international spirit transcending the particularism inspired by absolute national sovereignty. The SIOI accepted a government subsidy but retained its independence. The government, for its part, has found it valuable to support the activities of this private society dedicated to international co-operation in a multilateral form.

The SIOI was essentially a political body striving to make an Italian contribution to international harmony and the maintenance of peace. In the field of cultural diplomacy, the government in 1946 followed the example of France by creating within the Ministry of Foreign Affairs a Directorate-General of Cultural Relations. This Directorate-General works in co-operation with the Ministry of Education's Directorate-General of Cultural Exchanges, its Department of Antiquities and

Fine Arts and its dependency the CIVIS (Italian Centre for Students' Educational Journeys). Information on events in Italy, including book reviews, is supplied to Italian diplomatic missions abroad by the Information Department of the Presidency of the Council of Ministers (Prime Minister's office). The Ministry of Tourism co-operates with the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and the Ministry of Education in promoting Italian artistic manifestations (including theatre and concerts) abroad and working for the co-production of films between Italy and foreign countries.

The Italian State Archives are of exceptional richness. A dependency of the Ministry of the Interior, they are concerned with collecting, cataloguing and making known private as well as public documents of historical interest. The extent to which these archives play a part in Italian cultural diplomacy became evident when, in the aftermath of the serious damage done to them by floods in 1966, many nations, as well as international organisations, co-operated with the Italian Government in their restoration.

The National Council for Research, a state organisation which nevertheless enjoys a largely autonomous status, exists to promote and organise research and advise the government on scientific and technical matters. In co-operation with the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, it is concerned with Italian participation in the activities of international scientific and technical organisations. It has thus come to play a significant part as an instrument of Italian cultural diplomacy, particularly in the sphere of collective action.

Another important instrument of Italian cultural diplomacy is the administratively autonomous, but largely state-controlled, broadcasting and television service, the RAI. But of even greater interest to the world at large, and more definitely cultural in purpose, is the *Biennale Internazionale d'Arte di Venezia*.

Created in 1895 by the Municipality of Venice, the *Biennale* was in 1930 given the status of an autonomous organisation, with a President appointed by the Prime Minister's office. Invitations to participate are sent to governments through the diplomatic channel. In 1930 an International Festival of Music was created within the framework of the *Biennale;* in 1932 an International Festival of Cinematographic Art; and in 1934 an International Festival of the Theatre. Run by a body of persons chosen for their distinction in the cultural world, the *Biennale* has proved to be an outstanding example of what can be achieved in the field of collective cultural co-operation.

Having been admitted a Member of Unesco in 1948, the Italian Government in 1950 created a national commission, drawn partly from governmental and partly from private circles, which has come to play an active part in the execution of Italian cultural diplomacy. This national commission undertakes three types of activity: to promote, organise and co-ordinate the contribution of Italy to the execution of Unesco's programmes; to make Unesco's actions known in Italy, particularly in the world of education, and to encourage local initiatives designed to contribute to the organisation's aims; and to organise its own national or international conferences or exhibitions within the same framework.

There is thus a multiplicity of bases within Italy from each of which a small part of Italian cultural diplomacy is directed. Mention must be made of two more, before attention is given to the centres of operation outside Italy. One of these, the Institute for the Middle and the Far East, came into being in 1933 but did not acquire legal personality until 1947. The other, the Italo-Latin-American Institute, was founded in 1966. The former started its existence, in the fascist era, as an organ of propaganda, but has undergone an evolution since the war. The latter, founded only recently, is a multilateral organisation in which Italy is one of the partners.

Outside Italy, the Italian schools abroad are the oldest instruments of Italian cultural diplomacy, some of them dating back to 1880. In 1967 there were 70 such schools run directly by the state, and another 220 in receipt of a government subsidy, but managed by religious orders or lay bodies. Of these schools, 170 were located in Africa and 79 in Latin America. No more than a large minority of the pupils were of Italian nationality: the total of foreign pupils has been variously estimated at 27 000 or 45 000. These schools consume approximately one half of the funds available to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs' Directorate-General of Cultural Relations.

The second oldest instrument of Italian cultural penetration abroad is the Dante Alighieri Society, which arose out of the Manifesto of 1889 mentioned in the first chapter. The Manifesto was a slightly belated extrapolation beyond the shores of Italy of the spirit of the *Risorgimento*. It drew attention to the cultural activities beyond the frontiers of their own countries of Germans, of Slavs and of Frenchmen. In emulation of these activities Italians should keep alive the knowledge and use of the Italian tongue and the consciousness of their homeland among their compatriots dispersed throughout the world. This should be done by founding and financing schools, libraries, clubs and courses of Italian language and culture; disseminating books and publications; organising lectures and artistic and musical manifestations.

The Dante Alighieri Society maintained itself out of private subscriptions until 1960, when it was allotted an annual government grant of 50 million lire. Having come to be regarded with suspicion abroad as an instrument of fascist propaganda, it found itself in 1946 with no more than 15 committees outside Italy. Ten years later, there were some 260: the largest number in non-communist Europe (155), the second largest in the American continent (71). The Society has had a succession of distinguished personalities in the post of President, and has since 1957 published a review, *Il Veltro*, which is described as the review of Italian civilisation.

At the end of the war, Italian cultural institutes abroad were also few in number, mostly in neutral countries. Now there are more than 50 such institutes, half of them in European countries, another 10 in Latin America. The original conception of the Italian cultural institute was a centre of language teaching, cultural diffusion, and the development of intellectual relations between Italy and the host country, if possible at university level. Since the war the tendency has been to aim at a wider public, often reached by means of Italian films. There has also been a transition from a purely literary and artistic specialisation to a more scientific appeal. The work of the Italian cultural institutes is complemented by that of Italian lecturers in foreign universities, and of course by cultural attachés – though these sometimes act simultaneously as directors of cultural institutes.

There exists therefore, both within Italy and in the world beyond, a fairly substantial infrastructure of cultural diplomacy, partly of governmental and partly of private origin, partly government-controlled, and partly government-subsidised. A centre of co-ordination exists in the Directorate-General of Cultural Relations of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, but this does not carry the weight, or wield the resources, of its French forerunner and counterpart in the Quai d'Orsay. The Directorate-General is responsible for the negotiation and implementation of Italy's bilateral cultural conventions, and for her dealings with Unesco, and with other international organisations concerned with multilateral cultural co-operation, particularly the Council of Europe. But the Ministry of Education, as already explained, has an important – indeed an essential – part to play in Italian cultural diplomacy. This in also true of France: but there the primacy of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs is more clearly established than it is in Italy. This apparent weakness of central control is no doubt a reflection of the fact that the Italian Government has been less possessed than the French of an urge to pursue a consistent policy of exploiting the possibilities of cultural diplomacy; less confident that such a policy was worth the money which it would necessarily cost.

2. In his study of *Italy's Multilateral Cultural Diplomacy* Umberto Gori recognises that it is not in fact possible to arrive at a clear idea of what sums are, in total, allocated to Italian cultural diplomacy, since their administrative dispersal is too confusing to allow a single global figure to be worked out. He does however give some figures which show trends, and has attempted a rough and ready comparison with three other countries.[1]

In 1946-47, the total budget of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs only just exceeded the very modest figure of 2 000 million lire: 7 % of this sum was provided for the Directorate-General of Cultural Relations. By 1964, cultural relations and technical co-operation jointly had risen to 21 % of a much larger total. In 1965 the percentage had declined to 19 %; in 1966, to 17 %. By 1968 the percentage had again gone down: this time to approximately 15 %. The figures for 1968 were a little over 10 000 million lire out of a total of rather less than 75 000 million.

In attempting a comparison with other countries, Gori suggests that the United Kingdom spends three times as much as Italy: France five times as much for cultural relations and six times as much for technical co-operation: the Federal German Republic nearly six times as much for cultural relations and more than twelve times as much for technical co-operation. These international comparisons cannot be pressed too far, when even the Italian figures are admitted not to be comprehensive: but what seems to emerge clearly is that, of the four countries discussed in this part of the present book, Italy devotes the smallest resources to cultural diplomacy, and Italian cultural diplomacy has suffered from an inconsistency of financial policy.

In this matter the government has received little guidance from parliament. The political parties have no definable attitude towards cultural diplomacy – except in so far as communist members have from time to time accused the government of showing reluctance to establish cultural relations with communist governments. In general, it is only a limited number of members, of whatever party, who have used the occasion of debates on the budget of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs to make any mention of cultural diplomacy. They have tended to do so in the context of a restoration of Italy's reputation and prestige in the aftermath of the damage inflicted upon them by the war; of economic reconstruction; and of maintaining links with Italians who have emigrated. In Italy, as elsewhere, neither cultural diplomacy nor technical co-operation are subjects which inspire the electorate. Such members of parliament as have spoken upon the subject have, however, been in agreement in regretting that more money has not been allocated to enable cultural diplomacy to be more actively practised.

Against this background of parliamentary apathy and ministerial uncertainty, it has been left to the private persons concerned with non-governmental cultural organisations, and, more significantly, to the limited group of senior officials – mainly in the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and the Ministry of Education – with responsibility for the execution of cultural diplomacy, to make such use as they could of the machinery put at their disposal within the limits of the financial resources made available to them. Let us look at what they have done.

Since Italian is not, as English and French are, a language of world-wide currency, the teaching of Italian would make only an indifferent basis on which to build an edifice of cultural diplomacy. Language teaching is, indeed, practised by the subsidisation of a proportion of the university and other Italian teaching posts scattered throughout the world, and by the holding of university courses in Italian language and civilisation provided for foreigners within Italy. The support of language teaching by book exports is, for the most part, left to commercial enterprise, but a small amount of public money is used to encourage such exports, particularly by means of bibliographical periodicals published in various foreign languages, and by promoting Italian participation in international book exhibitions, as well as organising Italian book exhibitions abroad in the framework of bilateral cultural conventions. Support is also given to teaching and book exports by the broadcasting of Italian radio and television programmes, some of which are despatched on record or film for rebroadcasting in Latin America.

If neither the spoken nor the written word can afford the basis for cultural diplomacy to Italy that they do to France and the United Kingdom, the Italians have nevertheless discovered a speciality which, in the post-Gutenberg era, may come to prove of ever-increasing importance. This is what Lessing classified as *Malerei* and McLuhan as "tactile" art. Gori's illuminating explanation[2] is unfortunately too long to quote, and too compact to summarise. It is not clear whether the exploitation of this speciality in Italian cultural diplomacy is the result of conscious planning or the instinctive manifestation of a national characteristic. Probably the latter: for it was foreshadowed, as we have seen, when in 1895 the Municipality of Venice inaugurated its *Biennale di Venezia.* In painting, sculpture, architecture – the plastic arts – Italy has a cultural heritage which has long been honoured abroad, and a tradition which her cultural diplomacy has found it natural to exploit. This exploitation has the advantage of being independent of the mediation of language.

When the International Association of Plastic Arts came into being, an Italian was the natural choice for its first Secretary General. And it was equally appropriate that Italy should have been selected as the headquarters of the International Centre for the Conservation and Restoration of Cultural Property. Unesco's Convention for the Protection of Cultural Property in the event of Armed Conflict arose out of an Italian initiative: and it was an Italian initiative which led to the signature of the Council of Europe's European Convention on the Protection of the Archaeological Heritage. With the preservation of Venice on its hands, it is remarkable that the Italian Government should have felt able to play so large and generous a part in Unesco's project for saving the Nubian monuments threatened with inundation by the building of the Aswan High Dam.

Another art – non-plastic, it is true, but like the plastic arts independent of the mediation of language – which has been widely used in Italian cultural diplomacy is music. In 1929 the *Accademia di Santa Cecilia* promoted the creation of the International Concert Federation, with a national bureau in each member state. In 1933 the *Maggio Musicale Fiorentino* began its task of presenting the works of the great foreign composers to an Italian public. Italian opera (particularly the Rome Opera and the Scala of Milan), Italian orchestras (such as the Boccherini Quintet, the Collegium Musicum Italicum, the Scarlatti orchestra of Naples), and Italian soloists have been sent on well-publicised and successful tours abroad by the Directorate-General of Cultural Relations. Italian cultural institutes abroad have been equipped with well-stocked libraries of records. Foreign musicians and young students have been brought to Italy to study music with the help of scholarships.

We have seen that the Venice *Biennale* was complemented, in 1930, by an International Music Festival, in 1932 by an International Festival of Cinematographic Art and in 1934 by an International Festival of the Theatre. In spite of linguistic difficulties, considerable success has been achieved in promoting tours by Italian theatre companies; and the contemporary Italian theatre has also been made known by means of a bilingual (Anglo-French) review.

The cinema has proved to be a singularly successful medium for making Italian creative art known throughout the world. Both documentary and feature films – mainly exported through commercial channels, but also promoted by embassies and cultural institutes – have drawn a wide foreign public. And in the practice of international co-production of films, both bilateral and multilateral, Italy is the leading nation, followed by France and the Federal German Republic.

In the field of international educational co-operation, Italy has adopted two specialities. One of these is the reduction of illiteracy, the other, adult education. Both of these specialities have been actively pursued by Italian delegations within the context of Unesco's programmes. Italy has also proved to be a more vigorous promoter than any other country of an educational activity carried out by a non-governmental organisation patronised and supported by the Council of Europe, known as European Schools Day. And Unesco has found Italy to be one of its most enterprising and co-operative Members in the field of the social sciences.

In the growing sphere of technical co-operation, Italy has given priority to multilateral over bilateral action. Not that bilateral action has been neglected; but emphasis has been placed on Italian participation in the programmes of international organisations. An Italian initiative, taken in conjunction with the International Labour Office, has been the foundation and regular support of the International Centre for Professional and Technical Education located in Turin.

Faithful to the example of Leonardo da Vinci, Italy has consistently regarded science as an integral part of culture: evidence of this is to be found in the variety of international scientific institutions which have made their home in Italy.

3. Italy's first post-war cultural convention was concluded with Belgium in 1948. By the terms of Article 10:

> The Contracting Parties will give one another mutual assistance in order to afford in each country a better understanding of the other's culture, by means of:
>
> *a.* books, periodicals and publications, reproductions of works of art;
> *b.* lectures and concerts;
> *c.* exhibitions of fine arts and similar manifestations;
> *d.* theatrical performances;
> *e.* broadcasting, films, records and other mechanical media.

The means whereby the two countries are each to obtain "a better understanding of the other's culture" are thus spelt out, and this article, or one in largely similar terms, has been reproduced in the greater part of Italy's subsequently-concluded cultural conventions. It will be noted that provision is thus made for the exploitation of Italy's speciality, the plastic arts, and for the employment of the modern mass media.

In many of the cultural conventions concluded by Italy the concept of "culture" is given an extended application. Thus archaeological research is frequently mentioned, and other subjects covered are science, technology, sport and the "understanding of institutions and of social life".

Italy's network of bilateral cultural conventions extends (figures for 1968) to 39 countries, geographically distributed as follows: Western Europe 15, Eastern Europe 5, Near and Far East 8, Latin America 7, North America 2, Africa 2. In addition there are 20 agreements relating to economic, scientific and technical co-operation with African states; an exchange of notes (with Portugal) on the subject of "intellectual property"; agreements with 12 countries relating to films (including co-productions); and 5 agreements dealing with tourism. The period of greatest intensity for the conclusion of agreements of a cultural nature was the years 1958-61.

In the process of recovering from the shock of the second world war, Italians became conscious of their historical talent for cultural co-operation. The conclusion of bilateral cultural conventions was an obvious method, very much in vogue during the post-war years, of finding an expression for this talent. But the new technique of collective cultural co-operation, now finding institutional form in a variety of international organisations, provided Italy with a number of openings which accorded well with the spirit – mentioned early in this chapter – which had inspired the foundation of the Italian Society for International Organisation (SIOI).

It was therefore of considerable significance to Italy to be admitted to Unesco in 1948, and in the same session of the General Conference (held that year at Beirut) to be given a seat on the Administrative Board. The incumbent, Count Stefano Jacini, in due course became Chairman of the Board. In 1950 the General Conference held its session in Florence. Count Jacini was eventually succeeded on the Administrative Board by Signor Vittorino Veronese, who from 1958 to 1961 held the post of Director-General of Unesco. We have already noted the important part played in the cultural diplomacy of Italy by the Italian National Commission for Unesco. The bureau created within the Directorate-General of Cultural Relations of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs for the express purpose of co-operating with the National Commission for Unesco was soon to become responsible for Italy's collective cultural action within Western European Union, the Council of Europe and other international organisations with a cultural programme.

Persons who have participated in some of the General Conferences of Unesco will have become aware of the fact that national delegations to this world-wide organisation which meets only once every second year need to develop not only a collective memory of what has gone before, but a highly-specialised technique of getting their policies favourably considered among the welter of confusing proposals put forward in so vast a concourse of conflicting interests. A few only among the 120-odd delegations have developed that collective memory and that specialised technique: and among that few the Italian delegation (which is necessarily a succession of delegations with only partial continuity among the members) is outstanding. Whereas therefore it is not easy for most Members of Unesco to pursue a consistent policy within that organisation with any success, Italy has found it possible and worth while to do so.

Special interest therefore attaches to the carefully-researched analysis made by Gori of the evolution of the policy pursued by Italy during twenty years of her participation in the General Conferences of Unesco.[3] Italian policy has evolved from a Europo-centric and élitist view of the organisation's mission towards an attitude of mass-enlightenment and scientifically-oriented technical co-operation; an attempt has been made to prevent the Italian speciality of "tactile" culture from being overlooked; the tendency of communist countries to exploit the organisation's possibilities of political propaganda has been resisted in favour of a constructive approach towards understanding between differing civilisations; and Italian experience has been drawn upon to help combat illiteracy in the developing world, to develop the use of audio-visual aids in education, and to encourage research into the social sciences.

In the early years of her membership, Italy was much concerned with the development of Unesco's structural organisation; and also with an attempt to emphasise the importance (partly by her own active example) of setting up widely-based and effective national commissions in the member states. In alliance with France, Italy also sought to encourage a more intensive and fruitful co-operation between Unesco and the numerous non-governmental organisations whose structure, experience and aims suggested that they could work with Unesco to its and their advantage. In later years Italian delegations found themselves able to make detailed and constructive criticisms of and contributions to Unesco's programmes along the general lines of policy with which Italy had become associated. Some of the results of this policy have become evident in the establishment, already mentioned, of a number of international centres of Unesco origin located on Italian territory.

Collective cultural co-operation in a purely European context forms the subject of Part III of this book. Gori attempts to analyse Italian policy within OECD, NATO and the Council of Europe,[4] while making it plain that national attitudes can be less clearly sorted out in the more closely integrated programmes of these organisations which are elaborated by small committees behind closed doors, and not made the subject of prolonged bouts of public discussion.

In the thoughtful chapter with which he concludes his study of Italy's collective cultural diplomacy, Gori poses the question of the relationship between aims and results. He tends towards the conclusion that Italy's action in this field has been characterised on the one hand by an insufficiency of purpose, and on the other by a flexibility of performance which has produced a variety of promising achievements. Italians have responded by natural inclination to the importunities of many nations to enter into governmentally-organised cultural relations: lack of determination to find the requisite financial resources has in fact made the Italian response fall short of the foreign demand. The fact that the promotion of the Italian language cannot be made the basis of Italian cultural diplomacy has compelled its executants to devise other methods, as described above: this has given to Italian action in this field a distinctive character largely consonant with Italy's long tradition — a tradition highly acclaimed by foreigners — of cultural achievement. The bilateral cultural diplomacy which was very much the vogue in the post-war years was readily accepted by Italy: the gradual development since the creation of Unesco of collective cultural co-operation was perhaps even more in accordance with the post-fascist spirit of the Italian people. In the broadly-based National Commission for Unesco, which has achieved a happy co-operation between government and officialdom on the one hand, and on the other the leaders of the nation's cultural life, Italy has evolved an effective instrument for international cultural co-operation. The desire to make this co-operation imaginatively vigorous seems to spring at least as much from a spontaneous national instinct as from any governmental policy. And its aim is to promote understanding among the peoples of the world in the interests of all.

Notes to Chapter IV

1. Gori, paragraphs 38 and 39.
2. Gori, paragraph 59.
3. Gori, paragraphs 49-54.
4. Gori, paragraphs 55-57.

V.

FEDERAL GERMAN REPUBLIC

1. In May 1945, the German *Reich* disappeared, and four victorious powers assumed the government of the country. After vicissitudes with which we are not here concerned Germany found itself divided by the iron curtain, and the western zones, in 1949, became internationally recognised as the Federal German Republic. Between 1945 and 1949 an intense form of cultural diplomacy was practised in the three western zones by the American, British and French Governments. Only with the coming into existence of the Federal German Republic was a German political authority able to begin to organise a system of cultural diplomacy of its own.

We have already seen how the French, after the liberation of Paris and even before the war in Europe had been fought to a finish, had set about pursuing their traditional practice of cultural diplomacy: there had been an inevitable discontinuity, but the will to resume, to expand, to improve had manifested itself without delay. We have also seen how post-fascist Italy had lost little time in following the French example, by setting up a Directorate-General of Cultural Relations in its Ministry of Foreign Affairs with the mission of co-ordinating the potential instruments of cultural diplomacy to serve a new policy free from the ideological taint of the fascist era. In Germany *The Rebuilding of International Cultural Relations by the Federal German Republic after the Second World War* (the title of Martinus Emge's study) could not be undertaken until four and a half years after the cessation of hostilities when, in January 1950, a nucleus of a cultural department was set up within the "Liaison Office between the Federal Chancellery and the Allied High Commission".

The intervening four and a half years were by no means uneventful in the field of cultural relations. Emge gives a valuable short account[1] of the growth of cultural relations between Germans in the three western zones and the three western allied occupying powers, and of developments leading towards a rebuilding within the future Federal German Republic of organisations which would have their part to play in the cultural diplomacy of the Republic. He also gives a picture[2] of the background against which the Republic's cultural diplomacy would have to be practised — a background which sharply differentiates the task of German cultural diplomacy from that of France, Italy and the United Kingdom. It will be necessary to sketch in a part of this background before an explanation is attempted of how the Federal Government set about its task of organising cultural relations with the outside world.

The most obvious disadvantage under which the cultural diplomacy of the Federal German Republic labours is the nazi legacy. Memories of what the nazi regime represented have lingered longer or more vividly in some countries than in others; but the practitioners of German cultural diplomacy have always had to take into consideration the possibility that actions on their part, which would be regarded as perfectly normal on the part of their foreign counterparts, might stir up memories or prejudices disadvantageous to the image of German civilisation which it was their task to portray. With the lapse of the years this handicap is diminishing, but it has not yet disappeared.

Another complication is the division of Germany by the iron curtain. Before the proclamation of William I of Prussia as German Emperor at the end of the Franco-Prussian war in 1871, Germany had been a collection of kingdoms and principalities. From 1871 to 1945 it had been a single nation and the precedence of the Prussian capital, Berlin, over the capitals of the lesser states of the Empire had become progressively strengthened when Berlin had acquired the added prestige of being the capital of Germany. Berlin was never, it is true, to such an extent the cultural centre of the nation as Paris is of France, or even as London is of the United Kingdom; and it had not the ancient prestige within the new Empire that Rome enjoyed when, at the same time, it became the capital of a unified Kingdom of Italy.

When, however, the Federal German Republic came into being in 1949, Berlin was physically surrounded by a Soviet-occupied eastern zone of Germany, later to become the German Democratic Republic. The former capital was itself divided by the iron curtain, to which the eastern Germans were in due course to give concrete expression in the form of a wall of partition. The Germans of the Federal Republic had access — sometimes a precarious access — to the three western sectors (under American, British and French occupation) of their former capital: the Republic's new "provisional" capital of Bonn showed no signs of being able to acquire the cultural significance (which had become particularly marked during the decade which followed the first world war) of the lost capital, Berlin. In pursuing their cultural diplomacy, the authorities of the Federal German Republic have to take into account the fact that their country has no cultural capital.

The division of the German nation into two political states is a fact with even greater implications for the cultural diplomacy of the Federal Republic, which comprises little more than half the territory of pre-nazi Germany: the remainder is almost equally divided between the German Democratic Republic and territories now absorbed by

Poland and the Soviet Union. Only some three fifths of German universities are located in the Federal Republic: several important German cultural institutions are now separated from the Republic by the iron curtain. A single instance will suffice to illustrate the importance of this fact: Weimar, an important cultural centre which houses the Goethe and Schiller archives, is in Eastern Germany.

Political necessity has thus imposed artificial barriers upon a cultural unity, in such a manner that the practitioners of cultural diplomacy of the Federal Republic are necessarily faced from time to time with problems which do not afflict their foreign opposite numbers. One of these is to find themselves in a foreign country pursuing their duties in competition with cultural representatives from Eastern Germany.

Two world wars have diminished the international importance of the German language. The collapse of the Austro-Hungarian Empire at the end of the first world war meant that German soon ceased to be the *lingua franca* of Eastern Europe. And the collapse of the Nazi *Reich* twenty-seven years later drove many persons of German racial origin in other countries to cultivate the use of the national language to the detriment of German. Nevertheless the populations of the two Germanys, of Austria and of German-speaking Switzerland make of German the mother-tongue of some 90 million persons in the heart of Europe. Moreover German emigration, largely to the United States, in the nineteenth century, and again after the first world war — particularly after Hitler had come to power, when Germany lost a great many of her intellectuals – has left an important residue of German speakers outside the heartland of the German tongue. Thus German is a more useful medium of cultural diplomacy than is Italian, though it is not an international language such as are English and French.

A factor which inescapably complicates the task of those engaged in the practice of the Federal Republic's cultural diplomacy is the very fact that it is a Federal Republic. Though foreign policy, and its instrument, diplomacy, are a matter for the Federal Government, we have seen from the two preceding chapters how essential for the practice of cultural diplomacy is a close association between the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and the Ministry of Education. In the Federal Republic education, and such cultural matters as fall under the jurisdiction of the state, are reserved to the *Länder*. Whereas the Foreign Ministries of France and Italy have each a single Ministry of Education with which to co-operate, the *Auswärtiges Amt* in Bonn has to co-operate with the Ministries of Education of eleven *Länder* governments. This clearly complicates not only procedure, but also the framing of policy. It inevitably slows down such matters as the negotiation of cultural conventions: the Federal Government must await the approval of eleven *Länder* governments before it can itself agree a text.

It is against this exceptional background that we must now consider the rebuilding of international cultural relations by the Government of the Federal German Republic.

2. In April 1949, during Stalin's blockade of Berlin, the Governments of the United States, the United Kingdom and France (the three western occupying powers) declared their intention of promoting the creation of a Federal German Republic within the three zones allocated to them by the Potsdam Agreement of 1945. After elections in August, the *Bundestag* and the *Bundesrat* met at Bonn in September. Theodor Heuss was elected President of the Federal Republic: Konrad Adenauer its Federal Chancellor.

Foreign relations were at first managed through a "Liaison Office between the Federal Chancellery and the Allied High Commission". In June 1950 this Liaison Office was upgraded into a "Department of Foreign Affairs in the Federal Chancellery". When, in March 1951, an independent Ministry of Foreign Affairs was created with its traditional name of *Auswärtiges Amt*, the Chancellor, Adenauer, became simultaneously Federal Minister for Foreign Affairs, with Professor Walter Hallstein as his Secretary of State in the new ministry (he had previously been Secretary of State in the Federal Chancellery).

On the proposal of Winston Churchill, the Federal Republic was admitted as an associate Member of the Council of Europe in 1950, and a full Member in the following year. Also in 1951 the Federal Republic became a Member of Unesco.

Adenauer and Hallstein had been quick to decide that the Federal Republic must organise itself for cultural diplomacy. A suitable person must be found to undertake this organisation: he was run to earth in the person of Rudolf Salat, a man who had been engaged in the international work of the *Pax Romana* movement, spoke French and English, had worked in a number of foreign countries, and had taken a constructive part in student movements. In January 1950 Salat, with the help of a single shorthand typist, set about organising a cultural department within the "Liaison Office". With the upgrading of the "Liaison Office" to a "Department of Foreign Affairs in the Federal Chancellery" in June, Salat acquired two administrative assistants. In 1951, when the new *Auswärtiges Amt* came into existence, Salat's Cultural Directorate built itself up to an establishment of 45 persons of all grades. In 1952 it was provided with an operational budget of 2.8 million Deutschmarks. This had risen to 9.8 m DM by 1954, when Salat was appointed counsellor at the Embassy of the Federal Republic to the Vatican. In little over four years he had laid the foundations of the Federal Republic's cultural diplomacy.

Emge quotes a note compiled by Salat from memory ten years after he had left the Cultural Directorate.[3] This note tells of the growth of the work from its pristine task of maintaining contact with the cultural representatives of the High Commission and establishing relations with Unesco and the Council of Europe. In the absence of any archives, it was necessary to have recourse to the documentation of any bodies within the Federal Republic which were trying to establish cultural contacts with foreign countries, in the field particularly of science, student exchanges and artistic relations. German-foreign societies were growing up, and their activities needed co-ordination and support. The Stuttgart Institute for International Relations and the Munich Goethe Institute were resuming their activities, which had been interrupted by the war, and were looking for financial subsidies. It seemed important to re-animate student exchanges through pre-existing institutions such as the DAAD *(Deutscher Akademischer Austauschdienst)* and the Alexander von Humboldt Foundation. This had to be done in co-operation with the Permanent Conference of the Ministers of Education of the *Länder* and with the universities. Co-operation with the Ministers of Education of the *Länder* was also required for the promotion of travel abroad for learned personalities, directors of museums etc., who in the early stages had to be provided with scarce foreign currency.

In 1950 Unesco set up an office in Stuttgart for the purpose of establishing liaison with the Allied High Commission and preparing for the creation of three Unesco Institutes in the Federal Republic. These were to be the Unesco Educational Institute in Hamburg, the Unesco Youth Institute in Munich-Gauting, and the Unesco Institute for Social Sciences in Cologne-Lindenthal. A Unesco National Commission came into existence with Professor Hallstein as its President, and this needed the co-operation of Salat. He was soon also involved in the work of the Committee of Cultural Experts of the Council of Europe at Strasbourg, and in the establishment of links with the College of Europe at Bruges, with the European Cultural Centre at Geneva, and with German membership of the European Centre for Nuclear Research (CERN).

One of the early tasks of the Cultural Directorate was to clarify the legal situation of German Institutes abroad which had been confiscated, particularly those in Italy. Complicated negotiations led to the signature early in 1953 of an agreement with Italy by which the institutes located in that country were restored to the Germans.

After the Federal Government had established diplomatic missions in foreign countries, German schools abroad began to resume their activities, and the teaching of German abroad was also once more built up. Funds were sought, and obtained, from the Cultural Directorate. The amount allocated for this purpose in 1952 was 600 000 DM. By 1954 the total had risen to 3 000 000 DM.

During this period of creating a Cultural Directorate Salat sought advice from foreign cultural attachés in Bonn, and paid a visit of several days to Paris where he studied the organisation and the work of the French Directorate-General of Cultural Relations. Another urgent task was to find persons capable of occupying the posts, now being created at the newly-opened embassies abroad, of cultural attachés. Some of these had to be released from the Cultural Directorate itself: but a few personalities from cultural life were also recruited. Among these were the writer Bruno Werner, who became cultural attaché at Washington; Dieter Sattler, a former Secretary of State for Fine Arts in the Ministry of Education of Bavaria (and later to become Director of Cultural Relations at Bonn), who went to Rome; the writer Eugen Gürster, who now spent a number of years in London; and Otto von Simson, an art historian, who became the permanent delegate of the Federal Republic to Unesco. In 1954 a first meeting was held of German cultural attachés abroad who were called back to Bonn to advise the Cultural Directorate in the light of their experience: the meeting set a precedent which has frequently been followed.

When Salat was transferred abroad in 1954, his place was taken by a senior career diplomat, Kurtfritz von Grävenitz, who was succeeded, less than a year later, by another career diplomat, Heinz Trützschler von Falkenstein. Like Salat, von Trützschler remained head of the Cultural Directorate for rather more than four years, during which the budget of his directorate rose from 22 million DM in 1955 to 61.6 million in 1959. This period also saw a closer integration of the work of the Cultural Directorate with that of the other directorates of the *Auswärtiges Amt;* a neater delimitation between its responsibilities and those of other departments of the Federal Government with cultural attributes, in particular the Ministry of the Interior; and a tidier working relationship with the Permanent Conference of the Ministers of Education of the *Länder*. When in 1959 von Trützschler was given an embassy abroad, the Cultural Directorate, whose pattern of operation had been worked out from nothing by Salat, was a highly-organised piece of the machinery of the *Auswärtiges Amt*, the co-ordinating centre of the Federal Republic's cultural diplomacy, with clearly-defined relationships with its partners in the Federal Government, in the *Länder*, and in the private sector.

Von Trützschler's successor was not another career diplomat, but a person of long politico-cultural experience: the Dieter Sattler of whom mention has already been made. He was to be head of the Cultural Directorate for seven significant years.

3. In the prehistory of the Federal Republic lie three occupation zones, American, British and French. The inhabitants of each zone were subjected to a different cultural influence, which came to be typified by the America Houses, the British *Brücke* (Bridge), and the *Instituts français*. A two-way cultural traffic developed in each zone

between the inhabitants of the zone and those of the occupying nation, so that the Federal Republic came into existence with a non-conventionalised but significant habit of three bilateral cultural flows.

As we have seen, the practice of collective cultural co-operation developed early in the life of the Federal Republic, through participation in the cultural programmes of the Council of Europe and of Unesco. Owing to the federal structure of the Republic, the negotiation of bilateral cultural conventions was necessarily a laborious business. The first of these was, nevertheless, concluded with the United States in 1953. Two further bilateral cultural conventions were signed in 1954, and four more in 1956, since when the number has steadily increased.

While this conventional network of cultural exchanges was being built up, the base of non-governmental action was also being enlarged. So long ago as 1947 the Friedrich Ebert Foundation, created in 1925 to develop in Germany an education for democracy and dissolved in 1933, had opened its new headquarters in Bonn. Two years later the *Deutsches Auslands-institut,* founded in 1917 but quiescent during the nazi era, resumed operations from its base in Stuttgart, and was in 1951 re-created with the new designation of *Institut für Auslandsbeziehungen* (Institute for International Relations). 1950 saw the resumption by the DAAD *(Deutscher Akademischer Austauschdienst),* founded in 1925, of its task of promoting the interchange of university personnel. The *Goethe Institut,* dating back to 1932, began to operate again in 1952. Its operations, and those of the DAAD will be described later.

Apart from these resuscitations, four new post-war creations deserve mention. The first to come into being, in 1949, was the *Carl Duisberg Society,* mainly financed by German industry. The society was concerned to apply European and American training programmes to German specialists, but also to encourage visits to Germany by their foreign opposite numbers. It also undertook adult education and the exchange of trainees.

Inter Nationes, to which reference will be made later, was founded in 1952, on government initiative but with non-governmental status, to promote international cultural relations.

Among the activities of the *Deutscher Kunstrat* (German Arts Council), founded in 1954, is the holding of German art exhibitions abroad, and of foreign art exhibitions in Germany. It also gives assistance to foreign artists studying and working in the Federal Republic.

A German section of the International Music Council was formed in 1953, and in 1955 took the name of *Deutscher Musikrat* (German Music Council). Its tasks include encouraging co-operation between national and international musical organisations; promoting musical activities and meetings, international as well as national; and assisting the international dissemination of musical works and exchanges between musicians and musical groups.

Thus the Cultural Directorate of the *Auswärtiges Amt* found itself the co-ordinating centre of a group of bodies, some of them departments of the Federal Government, some of them dependent on the *Länder* governments, some of them non-governmental, which all formed part of a widely-decentralised home base for the conduct of cultural diplomacy. In the later 1950s an argument began to develop, in public and in the press as well as in private, on the practicability of conducting a coherent policy of international cultural relations when the bases of action were so disparate. Two extreme solutions were discerned in foreign practice. In France, as we have already seen, a tradition of highly centralised government had made it possible for the Directorate-General of Cultural Relations within the Ministry of Foreign Affairs to act not only as the co-ordinator of the activities of other government departments and private organisations, but also as the formulator of policy. In the United Kingdom, as we shall see shortly, the government had handed over the execution of cultural diplomacy, and a large measure of the formulation of policy as well, to a single para-governmental body, the British Council. Was either model appropriate for adaptation to the requirements and possibilities of the Federal Republic?

The fact that Bonn, where the government (and consequently the Ministry of Foreign Affairs) was located was not the cultural centre of the Federal Republic – that the Federal Republic had in fact no single cultural centre – was one factor which militated against a solution which was obviously successful in Paris. An even more important factor was that the independence vis-à-vis the Federal Government enjoyed by the *Länder* in educational and cultural matters made it impossible for a department of the Federal Government to exercise the authority in such matters which could be exercised without difficulty by a department of the highly centralised government of France. The French solution could not therefore be adopted in the Federal German Republic.

A solution of the British type was, on the other hand, not an impossibility, and it found some authoritative advocates. Such a solution was in the end turned down by the Minister for Foreign Affairs, Herr von Brentano. So the British no less than the French model was rejected. It was at this stage that Dieter Sattler took charge of the Cultural Directorate, with the task of making the distinctively German system of cultural diplomacy fully effective.

Sattler inherited from his predecessor, von Trützschler, an administratively efficient machine in the Directorate of Cultural Relations, which had become the central point of a network – linking Federal

Government departments, the *Länder*, and the private sector – forming the home base from which the Federal Republic's cultural diplomacy was guided, rather than directed. Creative imagination and diplomatic tact were needed to get the most out of this machine, and Sattler was the right man for the task. Descended from a prominent professor of economics, a well-known painter, an equally well-known sculptor and a successful architect, Sattler had since the war acquired political experience as Secretary of State for Fine Arts in the *Land* government of Bavaria, and diplomatic experience as cultural attaché at the Embassy of the Federal Republic in Rome. It would be difficult to devise a better background for cultural diplomacy.

In his dealings with foreigners, Sattler had the advantage of considerable personal charm, backed up by an excellent knowledge of languages, which enabled him to project his dynamic personality with happy effect. He travelled a great deal and worked hard to show that the personality of the nation he represented was completely different from that of the nazi regime which had impressed itself so disastrously upon the consciousness of the world. He used great suppleness in cultural negotiations, both bilateral and multilateral, and was able to achieve much in the sense of transforming the German image abroad. He thereby showed himself to be a cultural diplomat of the first order.

His personal qualities, combined with his ministerial experience in a *Land* government, also stood Sattler in good stead within his own country. In the aftermath of the controversy, already described, about the pattern of German cultural diplomacy, he found it natural to persuade, without attempting to bully, private organisations, *Länder* governments and even other departments of the Federal Government in such a manner as to achieve harmoniously co-ordinated action consonant with the requirements of federal foreign policy. So much so that in 1960 the *Auswärtiges Amt* took the significant step of entrusting the management of German cultural institutes abroad to a private organisation, the Goethe Institute.

There was one respect in which Sattler failed to realise his hopes. He saw cultural diplomacy as having equal importance with the traditional political diplomacy and the well-established diplomacy of economic affairs. He had in fact made it a condition of his acceptance of the post of head of the Directorate of Cultural Affairs that he should be given equal rank (which his predecessors had not enjoyed) with the heads of the other directorates of the *Auswärtiges Amt*. Like Salat, the pioneer creator of his directorate, and unlike his immediate predecessor von Trützschler, he was not a career diplomat, and saw advantages in the appointment of persons not of the diplomatic career to important cultural posts. But the tendency now went the other way, and when such persons retired, it was more usual to replace them from within the ranks of the diplomatic service. Nevertheless, when Sattler left the directorate in 1966, two thirds of the posts of administrative grade were still filled by non-career personnel. Of cultural posts abroad, on the other hand, more than half were occupied by career diplomats. Meanwhile Sattler had come to the conclusion that to be appointed to his directorate, or to a cultural post abroad, was regarded by many diplomats as a step not conducive to their ultimate advancement. Not only was there difficulty in obtaining personnel of the requisite quality and enthusiasm for posts which fell vacant, but Sattler also encountered a lack of support in his attempts to secure the additional posts which he regarded as necessary for the effective execution of the work.

In obtaining the support of public and parliamentary opinion for cultural diplomacy, and consequently the necessary financial means to carry out the work of his directorate, Sattler was however remarkably successful. In 1959, the year in which he became head of the Directorate of Cultural Relations, he found a budget of 61.6 million DM. By 1966, when he relinquished his post, the budget had risen to 215.2 million DM. This represented about 40 % of the total budget of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. A few years later, Sattler died at his new post as Ambassador to the Holy See.

4. An important element in the formulation of cultural policy was added when in 1960 there came into existence a Cultural Policy Council, an advisory body of persons outside politics, drawn from the cultural life of the country, meeting two or three times a year under the chairmanship of the Minister for Foreign Affairs. The *Bundestag* too has shown considerable interest in cultural policy, and its Foreign Affairs Committee has a sub-committee for cultural work abroad. Thus both parliamentary and non-parliamentary influence is brought to bear upon the policy which it is the task of the Directorate of Cultural Relations to carry out.

In the execution of this policy, the Directorate of Cultural Relations has occasion to co-operate with a number of departments of the Federal Government beyond the walls of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. The Federal Ministry of the Interior is responsible for German archaeological and historical institutes abroad, and has interests also in university matters, sport and the cinema. The Federal Ministry of Scientific Research has an interest in establishing and maintaining the relations between German men of learning and their foreign counterparts. The Federal Ministry of Pan-German Affairs has the right to be consulted about the presentation of the Federal Republic abroad. The Federal Economics Ministry has an interest in the export of films and books and in exhibitions abroad. The Press and Information Office of the Federal Government co-operates with the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, whose Directorate of Cultural Relations has no information department of its own. The Ministry of the Family and of Youth is concerned with youth exchanges. The co-ordination of the several responsibilities of these departments for the purposes of cultural diplomacy is a considerable task for the Directorate of Cultural Relations.

Aid to developing countries, including educational aid, is the responsibility of the Federal Ministry of Economic Co-operation. The Ministry of Foreign Affairs retains responsibility for those cultural tasks in developing countries for which there is a precedent in developed countries. Development activities, however, including the establishment of professional and technical schools, and help to universities, are the province of the Federal Ministry of Economic Co-operation.

It has already been mentioned that, within the Federal Republic, matters educational and cultural are the responsibility of the governments of the *Länder*. While each *Land* retains its individual sovereignty in these matters, machinery for consultation and, indeed, a measure of co-ordination has been created with the institutionalising of a Standing Conference of the Ministers of Education of the *Länder*. It is through this Standing Conference that the Directorate of Cultural Relations is able to co-operate with the eleven *Länder* governments for the purposes of the Federal Government's cultural diplomacy. Attention has already been drawn to the complications experienced by the Federal Government in negotiating cultural conventions with foreign governments. The heart of the matter is that the negotiation of international conventions is a federal responsibility, while the greater part of the obligations undertaken in a cultural convention can only be carried out by the governments of the *Länder*.

The system of co-operation worked out by the *Länder* governments in matters educational and cultural has thus proved to be of application in international relations as well as within the Republic itself. We shall see in Part III of this book that co-operation among European Ministers of Education has come to play an important part in the collective cultural diplomacy of European governments. In such co-operation it is the Chairman for the time being of the Standing Conference who personifies education within the Federal Republic. Emge draws attention to a study of this subject by the Secretary General of the Standing Conference, Kurt Frey, entitled "The participation of the *Länder* of the Federal Republic in international cultural co-operation" and published in the *Jahrbuch der Auswärtigen Kulturbeziehungen* of 1965.[4] Let it be said in passing that the Standing Conference of the Ministers of Education of the *Länder* of the Federal German Republic provides an object-lesson in co-operation which could usefully be studied by the Conference of European Ministers of Education, of which more will be said later.

Emge makes a useful short summary[5] of the system of cultural diplomacy which has been worked out in the Federal Republic. Responsibility lies with the Federal Government, and is exercised primarily by the *Auswärtiges Amt*, specifically through the Directorate of Cultural Relations. This directorate is responsible for policy and for financial policy, it gives political directives, allocates funds, participates in the several decision-making bodies through its own representatives, together with those of other Federal Government departments and of the Conference of *Länder* Ministers of Education. Its effective powers are however limited. The actual work is to a large extent delegated. The German system lies somewhere in between the French, where a large Directorate-General of Cultural Relations not only directs but also itself undertakes the bulk of the work, and the British where a small Cultural Relations Department maintains liaison with (basically) a single operator, the British Council. The German *Auswärtiges Amt* operates through a multiplicity of specialised organisations, and by allocating funds to the latter is able to exert a greater influence on the general pattern of work than can the British Foreign and Commonwealth Office, whose funds are channelled to a single cultural agent which makes its own pattern of action. The *Auswärtiges Amt* can alter the emphasis of the work by allocating greater resources here and lesser resources there: the specialised agents can only operate each within the limits of the resources it receives, but they do not work to the instructions of the *Auswärtiges Amt*. If needed, organisations with a new specialisation can be created to fill changing needs.

The system is complicated to work, but corresponds with the conception of the federal organisation of the state which it exists to represent. It is difficult for the foreigner to find his way about the maze; and even career diplomats serving for a short period within the Directorate of Cultural Relations may scarcely have learned to understand its intricacies before the time has arrived for their transfer to other functions. Continuity of comprehension has to be provided by longer-term non-career specialist personnel. These disadvantages are however counterbalanced, and probably outweighed, by the opportunity which the system provides of utilising non-governmental talents and initiatives in the interest of the state, and by the concomitant diminution of the impact of day-to-day political currents on the resultant execution of the Federal Republic's cultural diplomacy.

5. The methods of operation of the specialised organisations encouraged and subsidised by the Directorate of Cultural Relations will have to be illustrated by means of a small number of important examples. Let us begin with the *Deutscher Akademischer Austauschdienst*.

Resuscitated in August 1950 with a first-year grant of no more than 7 000 DM, the DAAD had seen its budget grow by 1965 to 26.77 million DM. (Its financial resources are derived partly from the Directorate of Cultural Relations, partly from the Federal Ministry for Scientific Research.) With this sum the DAAD was in the latter year able to pay a staff of 100 persons, to send 365 German students on study-courses abroad and to bring 1 918 foreign students to study in the Federal Republic. The operations of the DAAD take place at the university level. In addition to organising and financing these exchanges of university students, and keeping in touch so far as possible with former students, the DAAD organises exchanges of university teaching staff, encourages visits by foreign men of learning to the Federal Republic, finds German lecturers for foreign universities, promotes scientific interchange, recruits qualified Germans for Unesco's Technical Assistance Programme, and gives assistance in the Federal Republic to persons sent there for university courses by other organisations. By this activity, the DAAD is able not only to serve as an instrument of cultural diplomacy but also to play an important part in the Federal Republic's programme of aid to developing countries.

During each of the two world wars German schools abroad suffered a decline. After the second world war it became important to eradicate the nazi image from them. The Directorate of Cultural Relations, in co-operation with the Conference of Ministers of Education of the *Länder*, accordingly worked out a new policy, covering three types of school. Out of a total of some 250 German schools abroad, about 40 are either fully or partly adapted to a German type of education. Most of these schools are in Europe, though such schools exist elsewhere to serve the needs of the children of German diplomatic personnel or German experts temporarily employed abroad. Schools of this type are growing in number. A second type of school is intended for the children of Germans who have settled abroad, offering a German education supplemented by teaching of the language of the country. This type of school is on the decrease. The third type of school is an evolution of the second type: a school where children of German descent and children of the country are educated together. A few of these schools still offer an education basically of German type: the majority offer an education of the type in force in the host country, with German used as the teaching language for less than half of the school hours. It is the third type of school which is particularly important for German cultural diplomacy. In 1968 the Directorate of Cultural Relations spent 78 million out of its total budget of 229 million DM on subsidising 250 schools in 41 countries with a population of 55 000 pupils.

The Goethe Institute, founded under the Weimar Republic in 1932, the centenary of Goethe's death, was resuscitated after the war with foreign encouragement and came to life again in 1952. Its object is the dissemination of German language and culture abroad. By 1963 some 50 000 foreign adults were taking part in language courses at more than 100 German cultural institutes abroad, and in 1967 some 11 000 foreigners were following similar courses within the Federal Republic. The Goethe Institute has become an immense language laboratory, where new methods of teaching German are worked out and applied.

text books prepared, and special courses designed for use by radio and television. As we have seen, in 1960 the Directorate of Cultural Relations decided to place all its cultural institutes abroad under the management of the Goethe Institute, which has an independent board of management on which the head of the Directorate of Cultural Relations and the head of the appropriate department of the Directorate, both have a seat. The Goethe Institute's operations within the Federal Republic are self-financing, those abroad are largely financed by a grant from the Directorate of Cultural Relations, which in 1967 amounted to about 44 million DM.

Inter Nationes was created in 1952 for the purpose of making the personality of the Federal Republic better understood by foreigners. It operates by making information, both general and specialised, available by correspondence and by means of published material. In 1956 *Inter Nationes* opened a reception centre for foreigners at Bonn, and it has since established branch offices in Berlin, Frankfurt, Hamburg, Munich and Stuttgart. One of its activities is to provide facilities for the Federal Government's official guests. Another is to supply books, reviews, films, slides and records to German cultural institutes abroad. It has also become a source of information for press as well as cultural attachés at German diplomatic missions, and also for German teachers employed in foreign countries.

The Franco-German Treaty of Co-operation of 1963 led to the establishment of a binational Franco-German Youth Office. This is an interesting new departure in bilateral cultural co-operation. During its first five years of existence, the Franco-German Youth Office, richly endowed with funds by the two governments, brought about 35 000 exchanges involving 1.8 million young persons of all social levels. So massive an operation is expected to have important results in promoting friendship between the peoples of the two countries, though these results will only become apparent with the lapse of time.

We have already seen how, very early in its existence, the Directorate of Cultural Relations found itself involved in the participation of the Federal Government in the work of Unesco and in the cultural programme of the Council of Europe. In the preceding chapter we saw that Italy, in refashioning its cultural diplomacy in the post-fascist era, found itself drawn naturally to collective cultural co-operation, which (as we shall see more clearly in Part III) was slowly developing in the early post-war years. This evolution of the third phase of cultural diplomacy had gone a little further when the Federal Republic came into being. In both countries the first, or cultural propaganda, phase was associated with a regime on which the nation had turned its back: both governments found themselves deploying the resources of cultural diplomacy along co-operative lines, bilateral and collective, more or less simultaneously. As has already been suggested, the decentralised base, conforming to a federal structure, of the Federal Republic's cultural diplomacy provides a small-scale model which might well be found to have useful lessons for application to international action in the cultural field.

Note to Chapter V

1. Emge, Chapter I, paragraphs 2, 3, and 4.
2. Emge, Chapter III.
3. Note prepared by Rudolf Salat for the annual report for 1964 of the Cultural Directorate of the **Auswartiges Amt**, quoted by Emge, Chapter 1, paragraph 5.
4. Emge, Chapter III, paragraph 8.
5. Emge, Chapter IV, paragraph 4.

VI.

UNITED KINGDOM

1. Of the four nations whose cultural diplomacy since the second world war forms the subject of Part II of this book, only the United Kingdom had completed the course of war without occupation, without invasion even, and therefore with its institutions intact. In the three preceding chapters we have seen how the French immediately resumed their temporarily interrupted practice of cultural diplomacy with a confidence of purpose unhampered by doubts of the value of such a policy; how the Italians, with very little delay but a more hesitant approach, nevertheless evolved a pattern of action well adapted to their special needs and abilities; how the Germans of the Federal Republic worked out a system fully consonant with the decentralised, federal structure of their new constitution. Only in the United Kingdom was uninterrupted continuity possible. We must now see what the British made of their unique possibilities.

During the war, overseas publicity had been handled for the British Government by three agencies, the Ministry of Information (a government department), the Overseas Services of the BBC (a nationalised corporation, independent of government control), and the British Council, whose exact status will be described shortly. At the end of 1945 the Prime Minister announced that the Ministry of Information would disappear, and the Foreign Office would become responsible for the work of information about British policy in foreign countries. The Overseas Services of the BBC were maintained: the future of the British Council was still under consideration.

Not until June 1946 was it announced to parliament that the British Council would continue to operate under its Royal Charter for five years, when the position would again be reviewed. A Cultural Relations Department was created within the Foreign Office to concern itself with the Council's policy and expenditure.

> The lines of demarcation between the work of the Council and that of the British Information Services were soon more clearly defined by the authorities. As the chief agent of the British Government for the conduct of cultural relations with other countries, the Council's task, in the wider sense, was to be that of furthering "long-term education in the English language, British arts and sciences, and British institutions". The

> Council was given full responsibility for the strictly cultural subjects . . . In dealing with the more general subjects concerned with other aspects of British life and thought, however . . . the Council was to take an educational approach . . . In other words, the Council's work in these general subjects was education, not publicity.[1]

An anomaly was that the British Council did not operate in the United States. In 1942, shortly after the entry of the United States into the war, the British Information Services had been established there as an agency of the British Government, absorbing the British Library of Information, founded in 1920, and the British Press Service, set up in 1940. With the disappearance of the Ministry of Information in 1946, the British Information Services came under the jurisdiction of the Foreign Office.

On the other hand, in 1946 the Secretary of State for the Dominions invited the British Council to set up offices in Canada, Australia and New Zealand. Since the Council had become established in a number of Colonies during the war, it now found itself with three sponsoring departments: the Foreign Office, the Colonial Office and the Dominions Office; the Council derived a part of its funds from each of these departments.

The extent of the British Council's independence of the government is not always clearly understood. When it received its Royal Charter in 1940, the Council was "created a Body Corporate", and its management was "vested in an Executive Committee consisting of not less than 15 and not more than 30 members". Nine Ministers of the Crown were each given the right "to nominate and appoint one person . . . to be a member of the Executive Committee". The Executive Committee was directed to appoint a Chairman and a Vice-Chairman or Vice-Chairmen, and was given the power to appoint a Director-General; all these appointments had to "be previously approved by His Majesty's Principal Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs for the time being".[2]

On paper, then, the British Council is independent of the government in that it exists by virtue of a Royal Charter, and is controlled by an Executive Committee on which the ministerially-appointed representatives are outnumbered by more than twice as many persons chosen from non-governmental circles (they are drawn from universities, from the arts and sciences, from industry, publishing, the Trades Union Congress, and from both sides of the House of Commons). To what extent, however, can it be claimed that an organisation is independent of the government when its Chairman, Vice-Chairmen and Director-General can only be appointed with government approval, and when it depends on public funds for the overwhelmingly greatest part of its financial resources?

00102

The British Council has repeatedly been under scrutiny by governmentally-appointed committees, and in 1971 by a committee of the House of Commons. This last (the Expenditure Committee) looked closely at the question of the Council's independence. "The Council", says the Expenditure Committee's report,

> are justly proud of their status as an independent organisation, established by Royal Charter, and they took pains to emphasise to the sub-committee their freedom from governmental control. The Duncan Report[*] commented that "it is clearly of great value that the British Council, as a cultural relations organisation, should be manifestly independent of the government of the day". The committee whole-heartedly endorse this opinion; they are sure that the great strength of the Council and the key to the successful relationships which they have clearly been able to build up in cultural and educational circles overseas is their distinct existence from H. M. Embassy and their evident "detachment from the political and commercial issues of the day". The committee would feel gravely concerned if this position of strength were in any way eroded . . .
>
> The Council are financed from government funds, and to that extent they naturally cannot enjoy the absolute independence of action which a self-financing body would possess: indeed, the government could, in theory, impose policy decisions upon them by the simple expedient of cutting off the source of financial supply. The committee are satisfied, however, that the relationship between FCO[†] and the Council does not operate in this way . . . The government would appear to have a considerable and in the end decisive influence on where the Council send their representations; once established in a particular country, the Council seem generally free to conduct their work as they consider fit . . .
>
> The committee feel strongly that cultural relations should be kept as far removed as possible from general considerations of foreign policy, and they are bound to point out that, so far as they could tell, the theory of the Council's independence did not always coincide with the reality.[3]

Among its recommendations, the Expenditure Committee included some suggestions for ensuring a greater independence of the British Council from the government. It thought that the method of electing members of the Executive Committee ought to be reviewed: and above all it saw no reason why the appointment of the Director-General should require the prior approval of the Foreign Secretary.

---

[*] The report of the government-appointed Duncan Review Comittee on Overseas Representation, 1969.

[†] With the disappearance of the Colonial Office, the fusion of the Commonwealth (formerly Dominions Office) and the Foreign Office, and the absorption of the Ministry of Overseas Development into the Foreign and Commonwealth Office, the British Council has, since 1971, had only one sponsoring department – the FCO.

In the light of the foregoing, it is possible to make the following assessment of the British Council's independence of government control. The fact that the government created the Council in the first instance as an independent body showed that it did not at that time wish to conduct cultural diplomacy directly. When it reviewed the matter immediately after the second world war, and repeatedly thereafter, the government maintained this attitude. As its financial grants to the Council grew, the government, through the sponsoring departments, kept an ever closer eye on the Council's expenditure, for which Ministers were responsible to parliament. In particular, it was the government which decided in what countries the British Council might operate. But while the manner in which the Council operated could be influenced by governmental representatives on the Executive Committee, this influence could not be decisive when a rather more than two-thirds majority of the Executive Committee consisted of persons with no responsibility to the government. With the prestige of a Royal Charter behind it, and parliament anxious to preserve its independence, the British Council can — and is expected to — run its affairs according to the collective judgement of its Executive Committee, though its dependence on public funds necessarily makes it pay attention to the wishes of the government in matters of its higher policy.

Let us now see how this body, nominally independent of the government and in practice enjoying a very large measure of independence, has managed the cultural diplomacy of the United Kingdom.

> 2. The war in Europe ended in May 1945. Sir Malcolm Robertson resigned from the chairmanship in June. A new government was elected in July. The war with Japan ended in August. Except that the ending of the war brought to a fairly abrupt conclusion one or two activities that had been created because of the war, none of the events just mentioned caused immediately any noticeable changes at headquarters or overseas. The bulk of the Council's work overseas did not seem likely to be altered by the coming of peace except, of course, that the total liberation of Europe would bring added demand and opportunities.[4]

So, after his retirement, wrote A. J. S. White, at the time Secretary General of the British Council. But, as we have already seen, it took the government a year to make up its mind what should become of the Council after the war. In the financial year 1938-39 the government had contributed £130 000 to the Council's finances: by the last financial year of the war (1944-45) this had risen to £3 500 000. While the government was doing its thinking about the future of the British Council, it reduced its grant for 1945-46 to £2 800 000. By a redistribution of its resources, however, the Council succeeded in opening activities in a number of the liberated countries of Europe, and by the end of March 1946 it had established its representation in a total of 46 countries overseas.

The government's decision, announced in June 1946, was in effect to put the Council on probation for a period of five years. The post of Chairman had been vacant for a year: the Chairman now appointed was General Sir Ronald Adam, who had been Adjutant-General of the Forces for a great part of the war. He gave to the British Council the firm direction which it so greatly needed at this time of uncertainty. In 1947 he assumed the post of Director-General, as well as Chairman: in 1954 the posts were separated, and a new Director-General appointed, while Sir Ronald remained Chairman until 1955. By that time, as we shall see, the Council was launched on a period of steady growth: Sir Ronald Adam had steered it through nine years of uncertainty to a finally favourable course.

The exceptional wartime situation, described in an earlier chapter, had left the British Council equipped with a splendid network of contacts all over the country skilled in looking after visitors of diverse nationalities and multifarious interests. Though new post-war demands for overseas activities made inevitable a diminution of these home services, the Council has nevertheless made valuable use of its wartime experience, and is outstandingly well equipped to handle scholars, visitors and bursars from overseas; trainees, when these began to arrive under technical assistance and other schemes; specialist groups arriving for courses and study tours; and overseas students requiring reception, accommodation and other services. By the financial year 1969-70 expenditure on these home services was to have risen once more to close on £2 million.

The three years which immediately followed the end of the war saw the Foreign Office urged by British Ambassadors in the liberated countries of Europe to encourage the British Council to start operations in these countries. Even with the restoration of its grant to £3½ million in 1946-47, the Council had to make reductions of expenditure in the Middle East, Latin America and such European countries as Spain, Portugal and Turkey, where (owing to their neutrality) it had been able to operate on a large scale during the war. The priorities urged upon the Council by the Foreign Office were now the newly-accessible European countries, Austria, Hungary, Poland, Czechoslovakia, Italy, Greece. The Council itself placed its emphasis on satisfying the desire of educationists, scientists, artists, sociologists to establish with their British counterparts the contact which had been denied them for so long.

At this time of considerable geographical expansion unsupported by a comparable expansion of financial resources, the British Council began to reduce the extent of its English-language teaching and diminish its support of British-run schools in foreign countries. This resulted in protests to the Foreign Office from a number of British Ambassadors, particularly in the Middle East. In August 1949 the Foreign Secretary, Mr Ernest Bevin, asked the British Council to reconsider its change of policy. He stated that the government regarded the promotion of English teaching as the Council's most important task; he also hoped that the Council would further the spread of the British school system abroad.

In 1947 the Select Committee on Estimates of the House of Commons decided to examine closely the British Council's grant, which was once again standing at £3½ million. The Council emerged very well from this examination, which resulted in parliamentary support of the value of the Council's work and of the importance of the Council's independence.

3. But now the government ran into financial problems and balance-of-payments difficulties which were to lead to the devaluation of the pound in 1949. The immediate effect on the British Council was that its total grant was cut from £3½ million in 1947-48 to £3 150 000 in 1948-49. At the same time pressure was put on the Council by the government to expand its representation in the Colonies, and to establish representation in the newly-independent Commonwealth countries of India and Pakistan and the newly-independent foreign country of Burma. Representation was also established, at the request of the Foreign Office, in Indonesia and Thailand.

While the British Council's expenditure in the Commonwealth and the Colonies expanded to a maximum in 1950-51 before entering on a decline, its grant from the Foreign Office fell from £2 570 000 in 1948-49 to £1 682 000 in 1952-53. Accordingly the Council had to withdraw in 1948 from Iceland, Switzerland, French North Africa, Bolivia, Ecuador and Paraguay; in 1950 from the Sudan; and in 1951 from Ethiopia. These withdrawals created so much ill-will that they probably undid the goodwill which the Council's work in those countries had previously achieved. In 1950 the Council was requested by the Governments of Hungary, Czechoslovakia and Bulgaria to withdraw its representation from these countries where, since the establishment of the Cominform at the end of 1947, the work of its representatives had become increasingly difficult: in Poland however, as well as in Yugoslavia, though restrictions were imposed, the work went on. In China the Council's activities had been progressively hampered since the advent of a communist government, and in 1952 the Council closed its centres and withdrew from China, opening instead in Japan, in the wake of the signature of the peace treaty with that country.

In the Middle East and in Latin America the Council found it necessary to reduce the extent of its activities in the countries from which it had not withdrawn. Throughout the world its modest but very successful efforts in promoting British art – the international reputation of such artists as Henry Moore and Graham Sutherland owed much to the Council's promotion – had to be seriously cut, and the purchase of books for libraries overseas was reduced from £81 000 in 1947 to less than £20 000 in 1952.

The cuts in the British Council's activities during those years of retrenchment fell heavily upon its work in and towards foreign countries, and particularly heavily upon its European work. Yet during those years the government had concluded cultural conventions with France, Belgium, Czechoslovakia, Greece, Italy, Luxembourg, the Netherlands and Norway, as well as with Brazil. In these conventions the British Council was named as the government's agent, provided the secretariat of the British section of the mixed commissions, and was expected to meet the commitments of the conventions without any financial compensation.

In the early years of collective cultural co-operation (the activity which forms the subject of Part III of this book) the British Council played its part to the full, in spite of the financial difficulties just described. Its Chairman, Sir Ronald Adam, was for some time a member and then Chairman of the Executive Board of Unesco; and the British Council became the recognised agent of the United Nations for the administration in the United Kingdom of the fellowships of its specialised agencies. Throughout the existence of the Cultural Committee of the Brussels Treaty Organisation (later Western European Union), the British Council was represented on that committee and played a prominent part in organising the British share of its activities. The Council provided the second Chairman of the Committee of Cultural Experts of the Council of Europe, and maintained its representation on that committee also for ten years. But this most modern development of European cultural diplomacy eventually lost its appeal for the British Council, which, as we shall shortly see, was to develop more and more the extra-European aspect of its world-wide activities. Europe, and the cultural programme of the Council of Europe, were not destined to become an area of priority for the British Council again until 1972.

Having in 1946 put the British Council on probation for five years, the government early in 1951 set up an inter-departmental working party to consider the value of its activities and make recommendations about its future. Meanwhile the Council's grant was once more reduced. Then in the spring of 1952 a new government announced the appointment of a non-official advisory committee under the chairmanship of the Earl of Drogheda "to assess the value, actual and poten-

031[illegible]7

tial, of the overseas information work of the Foreign Office, Commonwealth Relations Office, Colonial Office, Board of Trade and Central Office of Information; the external services of the BBC; and the work of the British Council; to advise upon the relative importance of different methods and services in different areas and circumstances and to make recommendations for future policy". While this investigation was going on, the existing level of activity was to be maintained. This proved to be the British Council's low-water mark. From now on the tide was going to come in.

4. The Drogheda Committee did its work thoroughly, some of its members visiting a number of the British Council representations in Commonwealth, colonial and foreign countries. Its report was presented to the government in July 1953, but not published until April 1954. In December 1954 the government announced its intention to accept the broad principles of the report, in which it was declared that the British Council's work was of national utility and efficiently performed; that the Council could operate more satisfactorily as a chartered body standing somewhat apart from the government machine; that it needed continuity of planning and finance; and that there were great opportunities for the Council's work in Asia and Africa, which required substantial extra funds. The committee recommended economies in the British Council's work in Europe and an overall change of emphasis from cultural work (the export of art exhibitions and theatrical and orchestral tours) to educational work, in particular the teaching of English. It praised the Council's work in looking after visitors and students within the United Kingdom, and recommended an increase in the grant of scholarships and bursaries. The supply of books and films to British Council centres overseas should be restored to a satisfactory level.

In the year during which the Drogheda Report was submitted to and examined by the government, the British Council's grant had sunk to £2 650 000. Now began a series of increases: to £5 300 000 in 1959-60 and to £10 million in 1964-65. Further increases since that date have done little more than keep up with the decline in value of the pound.

The fluctuations in the British Council's financial fortunes since the war and above all the uncertainties entertained by the government about its future had not only been bad for the moral of the Council's staff, but had made it impossible for university appointments boards to recommend it to graduates in search of a career. The Drogheda Report changed the atmosphere completely. It at last became possible to work out satisfactory conditions of established and pensionable service; and in April 1956 the Foreign Secretary (Sir Anthony Eden, later Lord Avon, who had been Foreign Secretary also when the Council was founded in 1934) wrote to the Vice-Chancellors of all the

British universities saying that he would "be most grateful if your authorities concerned with appointments would in due course bring to the attention of potential candidates the importance which Her Majesty's Government attach to recruits of good quality coming forward to enable the Council to fulfil its responsibilities". He added that "it is the hope and intention of her Majesty's Government that the Council shall remain a permanent feature of the British Overseas services".

In 1955 the government began the negotiation of a series of short-term bilateral agreements with the Soviet Government for Anglo-Soviet cultural exchanges. These agreements were of an altogether different nature from the overall bilateral cultural conventions which had been by now concluded with a wide range of non-communist countries, and they required special machinery for their implementation. The government accordingly asked the British Council to set up a Soviet Relations Committee, which thereupon became the officially-recognised channel for those exchanges.

An anomaly which was not to be finally rectified until 1959 was the handling of cultural relations with the Federal German Republic. It was natural that educational and information work in the British zone of occupied Germany should be handled directly by the government between the end of the war in 1945 and the recognition of the Federal German Republic in 1949. In 1951 the narrowly "cultural" work was taken over by the British Council; but in 1954, on the recommendation of the Drogheda Committee, a German Education and Information Department in the Foreign Office resumed this activity and carried it out through the agency of a department of H. M. Embassy in Bonn. In 1959 the work was permanently transferred to the British Council, which appointed a representative in Cologne and established centres in Hamburg, Munich and Stuttgart. With the transfer, the nature of the work underwent modification, and its scale was considerably reduced: but an element of continuity was maintained by some of the staff, formerly employed on this work by the Foreign Office, continuing at their posts under the wing of the British Council.

In 1956 the government entrusted to a member of the Cabinet, the Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster (Dr Charles Hill, later Lord Hill of Luton), responsibility for co-ordinating the information services, including the British Council. "At last", writes White,

> there was an individual Minister who could take a look at the whole field of information work – in Commonwealth countries and Colonies as well as foreign countries – and who was highly enough placed in the government to be able to make his voice heard with effect. Dr Hill threw himself energetically into his task and visited most of the important countries: he soon made a diagnosis of the "information" problems and pressed his conclusions on his colleagues with great force. His appointment was to prove of very great benefit to the Council.[5]

There was now a Cabinet Minister, responsible for the co-ordination of information work, who soon gained first-hand knowledge of the Council's activities, both at home and in many other countries. Dr Hill favoured an expansion of the Council's work, obtained the necessary funds for this expansion, and gave the Council the most effective support it could hope to receive.

5. The British Council had reached the age of twenty-one in 1955. Its years of adolescence had been troubled: with the advent of manhood it was at last able to make its way in the world. It recruited and trained a highly professional staff of cultural diplomats, sheltered from the changing winds of politics. At the request of the government, it directed its efforts more and more towards Asia and Africa, and less to Latin America and Europe. It developed along peace-time lines its wartime speciality of organising the reception, welfare and in many cases accommodation of students from overseas, and of making arrangements to suit the requirements of specialist visitors. And it evolved techniques for the teaching of English as a foreign language, and made a speciality of teaching English overseas.

The Council was well aware that the demand for English teaching was greatly in excess of anything its own staff could fulfil. For some time it had given what help it could to universities and schools overseas seeking to recruit teachers of English, and teachers of other subjects in English. But many potential recruits hesitated to accept short-term posts with unknown employers, fearing to damage their career prospects when they returned to their own country. Here the Council now found it possible to help by giving British Council contracts to teachers going to posts offered by employers known to the British Council's representatives abroad. There had all along been a measure of co-operation between the British Council and the Ministry of Education: with the creation in 1957 of an Overseas Teaching Unit in the ministry that co-operation became greatly intensified.

The teaching of English overseas provided the British Council with opportunities of co-operation both internally and externally. The Universities of London and Edinburgh conducted research into the subject of teaching English as a foreign language, following in the footsteps of the French who had evolved important new techniques in the teaching of French as a foreign language. The Council now began to send some of its English-language specialists to attend post-graduate courses at those universities. It followed this up by co-operating with the Institute of Education of the University of London by offering post-graduate studentships to honours graduates to qualify them in the techniques of teaching English to foreigners.

Externally the British Council found that the Americans too were concerned in an intensive programme of teaching English all over the world, a subject in which much research had been carried out in the United States. Co-operation was accordingly established between the Council and the United States Information Agency, and a joint programme was adopted. Both Unesco and the Council of Europe have found the British Council a valuable ally in their projects for the promotion of the wider, more intensive and more efficient teaching of languages.

In the eyes of the government, the British Council's special expertise in all aspects of English teaching was seen as having a particular value where much of the former British Empire was evolving to independence, whether within or without the Commonwealth. Whether or not English remained the official language in the newly independent countries, there was immense demand for a knowledge of the language, and immense opportunity for an organisation which was outstandingly well-equipped not only to meet a substantial part of that demand, but also to give general educational advice and to help with the development of public library systems. The demand for English teaching has been so great that the Council has found it necessary, particularly in developing countries, to move from direct teaching to teacher-training, thus indirectly achieving far wider results by means of the so-called multiplier effect.

The British Council's well-developed expertise in looking after students, trainees and specialist visitors within the United Kingdom was also seen by the government as having a particularly valuable application where these students, trainees and specialist visitors came from countries which had recently been under British rule. The Council's expertise in this matter was moreover welcome to various specialised agencies of the United Nations, which had to find facilities of many kinds in developed countries for persons from the developing world, and were able to look to the British Council for efficient partnership in this important and complicated operation.

6. Mention was made in an earlier chapter of the pioneering work of Lord Lloyd as Chairman of the British Council from 1937-41; and in the present chapter of Sir Ronald Adam's achievement in steering the Council through difficult seas during his long tenure of the chairmanship from 1946-55, for seven years of which (1947-54) he was Director-General as well. In 1954, a year before his retirement from the chairmanship, Sir Ronald had relinquished the director-generalship to Sir Paul Sinker, a former university lecturer who had moved into the Civil Service, had worked in the Admiralty and the Treasury, and had subsequently become First Civil Service Commissioner. Coming to the post of Director-General at the time when the government was still considering the Drogheda Report, Sir Paul became the administrative head of an organisation to which the government was about to give steadily increasing financial resources, with which to carry out work

of steadily widening scope. It was of considerable advantage to the British Council to be able to build itself into a highly professional body of cultural diplomats under so competent an administrator, who remained the servant of the Executive Committee and the head of the organisation which it controlled for fourteen years, until his retirement in 1968.

It will be recalled that the Drogheda Committee was set up by the government in 1952 to look into the overseas information work of a number of government departments; the external services of the BBC; and the work of the British Council. It is noteworthy that the government consistently looked upon the British Council as one among a number of agencies concerned with projecting the image of Great Britain to the peoples of other countries. The explanation of governmental policies was of course a matter for government departments; the BBC's speciality was the giving of news, in regard to which it had won for itself an enviable reputation during the war, so that what needed to be considered here was simply how much money the government was prepared to spend on which of the BBC's overseas services; whereas for the first twenty years of the British Council's existence successive governments seem to have entertained some uncertainty as to whether they were justified in keeping the Council in existence, if so for what purposes, and at how much expense. What good did it do? was the constant query. Hence the fluctuations in the Council's fortunes until first the Drogheda enquiry and second the appointment of Dr Hill as co-ordinator of the information services served to establish the necessity for the Council's work in the mind of Ministers and officials. Parliament for its part seems to have been a much more consistent believer in the Council's worth.

It has been to the great good fortune of British cultural diplomacy that its direction and execution have rested with persons subjected, it is true, to fluctuating governmental influences, but standing outside the government's control. The conflict in recent years has been between the desire of governments to see new work undertaken without being willing to provide additional funds, and the recognition by the British Council that the nature of its work requires long-term planning and continuity, and not such disastrous mistakes as going into a country and then, a few years later, pulling out again because money had to be switched to meet new demands. Though conflicts continue between what the Council would like to do and what the government is willing to pay for, a more or less satisfactory partnership between government and Council seems to have been achieved.

In particular, the signature by the government in January 1972 of a Treaty of Accession to the European Communities had an immediate impact on the British Council's work. In March the Chanceller of the Duchy of Lancaster, Mr Geoffrey Rippon, announced that an additional sum of £ 3.5 milion would be made available to the British Council over a period of four years to enable its work in European countries to be expanded. The Royal Society was also to receive additional (though very much smaller) grants, so that it could double the number of fellowships which it offered under the Western European Scientific Interchange programme. The Department of Education and Science was to be allowed more money to spend on expanding its contribution to a Council of Europe scheme for the training of teachers, adopted on British initiative in 1971, and to invite teachers from Council of Europe countries in substantial numbers to attend a variety of training courses in the United Kingdom. Funds would also be made available to enable the Centre for Information on Language Teaching (CILT — an independent foundation set up in 1966 and subsidised by the Department of Education and Science) to co-operate with the British Council's English Teaching Information Centre (ETIC) in playing a more active role in the Council of Europe's modern language programme by providing a European centre for information on current research in modern language teaching.

These and other projects announced at the same time show that, with its impending entry into the European Communities, the Government of the United Kingdom became conscious of the importance of participating more actively in the collective cultural diplomacy of the Council of Europe, as well as of intensifying its bilateral cultural relations with other European countries. As we have just seen, during the years of governmental uncertainty the necessary machinery was nevertheless being developed. It was therefore ready for more intensive use once the need had become recognised.

Notes to Chapter VI

1 McMurry and Lee: p. 173.

2. Extracts from the Charter of Incorporation granted to the British Council by King George VI in 1940.

3. First Report from the Expenditure Committee, Session 1970-71, The British Council (London, HMSO): pp. xl, xli.

4. White: p. 58.

5. White: p. 105.

PART III

COLLECTIVE EXPERIENCE

VII.

THE NORDIC FIVE

1. The Scandinavian word *Norden* (the North) is the accepted common term for the geographical region consisting of the three Scandinavian states Denmark, Norway and Sweden plus Finland and Iceland. These five Nordic countries have all by now signed or acceded to the European Cultural Convention, and consequently play their part in the collective cultural co-operation of the twenty-one European members of the Council for Cultural Co-operation of the Council of Europe and of the Conference of European Ministers of Education, which will shortly be described. In this they resemble the seven Members of Western European Union. But whereas the collective cultural activities of the seven of Western European Union (which grew out of the cultural co-operation of the original Brussels Treaty five) were, as we shall see in due course, ultimately merged into those of the Council for Cultural Co-operation, the five Nordic countries have maintained and intensified their own collective cultural co-operation, while participating fully in that of the larger European group.

The present political division of Norden into five separate sovereign states is the outcome of a long and chequered historical development, where sometimes centripetal and sometimes centrifugal forces have been dominant. The outcome is that the five countries have very different national attitudes towards the outside world, compensated by a great deal of cultural attraction towards one another. This cultural attraction is intensified by an important linguistic factor: Danes, Norwegians and Swedes can understand one another's languages, and in the Nordic organs of co-operation enough Finns are able to speak Swedish, and Icelanders Danish, to make interpretation unnecessary.

The homogeneity of the Nordic countries is even more pronounced in other fields. They are all typical modern welfare states, with pronounced distribution of incomes and wealth, highly developed social services, a high level of education, a common adherence to Lutheran Protestantism, and very similar political constitutions. This homogeneity has not prevented the five governments from pursuing incompatible policies in matters of foreign relations, defence and economics: it has however facilitated cultural co-operation which seems to be regarded as in some measure a counterweight to the diversity of political attitudes. The second world war led the five Nordic countries into three different camps, two of which were at war with one another. A quarter of a century after the war, Norden remained politically disunited. Paradoxically, this failure to see eye to eye with one another in matters of foreign policy inspired in the peoples of the five countries an urgent desire for cultural co-operation.

It should be remembered that much of the early cultural heritage of the Nordic nations either was or has long been regarded as common property, either because it belonged to a time before national boundaries had been fixed, or because it had served as a common basis for all the national cultures. In particular, the rich Old Icelandic literature is treated as Nordic. Though inside Norden people are Danes, Finns, Icelanders, Norwegians and Swedes, against a European or world background they feel that they have the same cultural heritage and are citizens of a common cultural community. The acceptance of a kind of double nationality, almost of a double citizenship, is the solid basis on which all modern Nordic co-operation has been able to build.

Before we look at the development of collective cultural co-operation among the Nordic countries, mention must be made of the thirty-odd funds, many of them wholly or partly private in origin, which have been created to promote specific forms of co-operation within the region. Nineteen of these funds operate bilaterally; a dozen finance cultural activities embracing three or more of the countries. The oldest of the private funds was established in 1873; the oldest governmental fund, the Danish-Icelandic fund, in 1918. It was only after the second world war that government participation in such funds became a part of their cultural policy.

2. During the second half of the nineteenth century the first successful attempts were made to harmonise parts of the legal systems of the Scandinavian countries, in particular laws on commercial and social matters. After 1917 Finland also joined in this co-operation. Work on these lines continued until the second world war, and though there was a measure of government supervision it was private initiative which played the greater part. At a conference in Stockholm in 1869 attended by educationists, linguists and writers (Henrik Ibsen was among them) a certain harmonisation of the spelling systems of the Scandinavian languages was agreed upon. But it was not until after the first world war that cultural co-operation became institutionalised, though at a non-governmental level, by the setting up of the national Norden associations.

The Norden associations are voluntary non-governmental societies which work, largely by contacts between professional bodies, exclusively for Nordic co-operation aimed at a closer unity in all fields among the Nordic peoples. Norden associations were set up in Denmark, Norway and Sweden in 1919, in Iceland in 1922 and in Finland in 1924. (The pattern was followed in the Faroes in 1951 and in the Aaland Islands in 1970.) In 1965 a Union of the Norden Associations was formed. Thus there has grown up a substantial infrastructure of non-governmental cultural co-operation among the Nordic countries.

Shortly before the second world war, in 1938 a meeting was held in Copenhagen of Nordic Ministers of Education. The agenda included the teaching of Nordic languages in schools and teachers' colleges, the exchange of teachers, students and schoolchildren, the revision of history textbooks, and a proposal to establish a Nordic college for the further training of teachers. Follow-up action was suspended as a result of the war.

In 1946 however the Swedish Minister of Education invited his Nordic colleagues to a second meeting of Ministers, which considered the report of the first meeting held in 1938. The Ministers also gave thought to a recommendation which had been made a few months earlier by the Nordic Interparliamentary Union, which had met regularly between 1907 and 1939, and was now able to resume its meetings. In the light of this recommendation the Ministers of Education advised their governments to appoint two members each to a Nordic Cultural Commission. In 1947 the Nordic Cultural Commission held its first meeting at Oslo. Its report was considered by the Ministers of Education, who in the following year met for the third time, also at Oslo.

So it was that, without the signature of any treaty, machinery for intergovernmental cultural co-operation among the five Nordic countries came into being. The initiative had been taken by a meeting – one of a traditional series – of members of parliament. A firm recommendation to governments was made by a non-institutionalised meeting of Ministers of Education. The governments created an institution. The Nordic Cultural Commission, meeting frequently, superintended by occasional meetings of the Ministers of Education, provided the means whereby the five governments could conduct a measure of collective cultural diplomacy which did not, however, supersede the substantive work of cultural co-operation carried out by the non-governmental Norden associations.

In its first form the Nordic Cultural Commission lacked direct contact both with government departments and with parliaments. There was also a marked dominance of university professors. The recommendations of the commission were submitted to the Ministers of Education, but there were no civil servants in the departments with the specific task of giving effect to the recommendations.

By 1951 all the governments had appointed senior civil servants to the commission, and had included national secretaries in their delegations. Then in 1952 a new piece of machinery was created which was to give added vigour to the Nordic Cultural Commission. This new piece of machinery was the Nordic Council, whose statutes were in due course adopted by the parliaments of all the five countries.

The Nordic Council is an initiating and advisory body on questions related to co-operation among the Nordic countries in all fields. It consists of both elected members and government representatives from all the participating countries. And among its five committees there is a Cultural Committee.

Reports from the Nordic Cultural Commission now went through the governments to the Nordic Council. The Council recommended that each national delegation to the commission should include a member of parliament, and that the commission should work in sections. The commission worked out proposals to the governments to give effect to the Council's recommendations. By 1954 the Nordic Cultural Commission had been reorganised: each national delegation now included two members of parliament and one senior official. The commission worked in three sections: one for higher education and research, one for education, and one for the arts and adult education. The national delegations and the three sections each now had a permanent secretariat.

In 1960 the Nordic Council began to press for a clarification of its relationship with the five governments. The outcome was the conclusion of a Nordic Co-operation Treaty, which was signed at Helsinki on 23 March 1962. The Helsinki Agreement, as it is commonly known, entered into force on 1 July 1962. It did not change the status of the Nordic Council as an interparliamentary organ of consultation, though it provided that the Council should be given on opportunity to express its views on questions of Nordic co-operation "that are of importance in principle, whenever this is not impossible due to lack of time".

The treaty dealt with co-operation in juridical, cultural, social and economic matters, communications, and other fields. The cultural clauses read as follows:

> Article 8. In every Nordic country, education and training given at school shall include, in a suitable degree, instruction in the language, culture and general social conditions of the other Nordic countries.
>
> Article 9. Each Contracting Party should maintain and extend the opportunities for a student from another Nordic country to pursue studies and graduate in its educational establishments. It should also be possible, to the greatest possible extent, to count a part examination passed in any Nordic country towards a final examination taken in another Nordic country.
>
> It should be possible to receive economic assistance from the country of domicile, irrespective of the country where the studies are pursued.

Article 10. The Contracting Parties should co-ordinate public education qualifying for a given profession or trade.

Such education should, as far as possible, have the same qualifying value in all the Nordic countries. Additional studies necessary for reasons connected with national conditions can, however, be required.

Article 11. In the fields where co-operation is expedient, the development of educational establishments should be made uniform through continuous co-operation over development plans and their implementation.

Article 12. Co-operation in the field of research should be so organised that research funds and other resources available will be co-ordinated and exploited in the best possible way, among other things by establishing joint institutions.

Article 13. In order to support and strengthen cultural development the Contracting Parties shall promote free Nordic popular education in the fields of literature, art, music, theatre, film and other fields of culture; among other things, the possibilities provided by radio and television should be borne in mind.

The foregoing articles are phrased in rather general terms, as an expression of agreed intention rather than in the form of specific commitments. In fact they amount to no more than a codification of work already being carried out by the Nordic Cultural Commission. The importance of the Helsinki Agreement, in the cultural field, lies in that it conventionalised existing practices, which thus now received formal sanction.

Nine years later, as we shall see, a decision to intensify Nordic cultural co-operation was formally expressed in a new treaty which not only spelt out what forms this co-operation was to take, but set up new machinery for the purpose. This will be examined in due course. Meanwhile we must consider what has been the effect of Nordic cultural co-operation within the framework just described.

3. It must be admitted that in the early years of its existence the Nordic Cultural Commission had little impact on Nordic cultural co-operation, which continued — and has all along continued — to be carried out by the non-governmental Norden associations.

Each national Norden association has local branches in most towns, and in many of the smaller municipalities. The number of local branches throughout the five countries exceeds five hundred. Their membership is made up of both private persons and organisations. The local branches have close contacts with the local authorities and other voluntary organisations. This has made it possible to create the system of "sister-towns" or "friendship-towns" which make a special contribution to Nordic co-operation. These "sister-towns" (and most towns in Denmark, Finland, Norway and Sweden have such links with towns in the other three countries, while a few also have links in Iceland, the Faroes and the Aaland Islands) arrange Nordic meetings between local authorities, conferences on topical questions, or holiday exchanges.

In the earliest years after the second world war, the Norden associations of Denmark and Sweden arranged visits for thousands of Norwegian and Finnish children to families in Sweden and Denmark, which had better food supplies. Since then millions of persons have made their first experience of meeting their fellows in other Nordic countries through exchanges of school children, students' meetings or conferences arranged by the Norden associations. It is in the fields of education, youth work and general information that these associations have been most activo. Their aim is to create possibilities for all children to spend at least a week, not less than once during their school years, as pupils in a school in one of the other countries. Every year the Norden associations organise residential courses or seminars to a total between fifty and sixty.

In its early years the Nordic Cultural Commission gave thought to such matters as co-operation in research, exchanges of university students, fellowships, harmonisation of university examinations, common textbooks and library questions. But it had neither the administrative structure nor the financial resources to do more than make recommendations.

With the creation of the Nordic Council in 1952 and the reorganisation of the structure of the Nordic Cultural Commission in 1954, it became possible for the still rather rudimentary machinery for Nordic cultural diplomacy to be put into action. This action became more confident after the signature of the Helsinki Agreement in 1962, and more effective when, on the unanimous recommendation of the Nordic Council, the governments agreed to create a Nordic Cultural Fund. Instituted with a small grant in 1966, the Cultural Fund went into full operation in 1967 with an annual grant of 3 million Danish kroner (which had risen to 5 million by 1972), to be devoted to Nordic cultural co-operation in all areas.

Some years before the creation of the Nordic Cultural Fund, the non-governmental Norden associations had found advantage in co-operating with the Nordic Cultural Commission and the Nordic Council. The co-operation worked in both directions: not only were persons active in the work of the Norden associations appointed as members of official advisory bodies, but members of parliament belonging to the Nordic Council and civil servants working in the Nordic Cultural Commission found themselves elected to the governing bodies of Norden associations.

As a result, the work of the Norden associations was brought officially to the notice of the parliaments and the governments, and these for their part were able to influence the work of the Norden associations. This co-operation led the Nordic Council to recommend, and the governments to agree, to give subsidies to the Norden associations, and thus enlarge their effectiveness.

Thus the non-governmental infrastructure of cultural co-operation among the Nordic countries, created and exploited since the end of the first world war by the Norden associations, found itself supported and strengthened after the second world war by the creation of intergovernmental machinery for the conduct of collective cultural diplomacy. This machinery consisted at the ministerial level of non-institutionalised and periodical meetings of the Ministers of Education; at a preponderantly parliamentary level of the Nordic Council; at a more official level of the Nordic Cultural Commission, and since 1966 of the Nordic Cultural Fund.

The Ministers of Education met essentially to exchange information and ideas on common problems, but also to agree on action to be taken in common. Apart from such essentially educational problems as the rapid expansion of university education, the Ministers gave thought also to such matters as Nordic co-operation in broadcasting and television, joint Nordic representation at the Venice *Biennale*, literature for children and young people. The Ministers also found themselves considering cultural recommendations received from the Nordic Council. These they tended to refer for study and advice to the Nordic Cultural Commission.

The Nordic Council for its part, acting through its Cultural Committee, played the role of an initiator of ideas for co-operation in the cultural field. Among other innovations, it created two important cultural prizes. The first of these was a prize for literature awarded every year from 1962 onwards to a writer from one of the Nordic countries. A similar prize for music was first awarded in 1965, next in 1968 and thenceforward every second year. These two prizes (each of 50 000 Danish kroner) were created by the governments on the initiative of the Nordic Council: the statutes were drawn up by the Nordic Cultural Commission.

This rather pragmatic pattern of cultural diplomacy remained in operation until the end of 1971, when it was superseded by a new structure created by the Nordic Cultural Agreement signed in that year. The Nordic Cultural Commission was the first piece of formal intergovernmental machinery to be put into operation in 1947 for the purpose of collective cultural diplomacy among the Nordic states. It continued until its supersession to act as the executive organ for the conduct of this collective cultural diplomacy. Its final report gave a summary of its work, an attempted evaluation, and some ideas for future development.

4. "The Testament of the Nordic Cultural Commission", as this final report is often known, is made up of three parts, each compiled by one of the three sections in which, as we have already seen, the commission worked after the reorganisation completed in 1954. The first section, that for higher education and research, points out that its work has been carried out with a view to exploiting common Nordic resources, either through joint enterprises, or by a natural division of work between the countries. Some of the joint enterprises which the section has initiated have had as their objective a common Nordic research centre such, for example, as the Scandinavian Journalist Academy at Aarhus, the Nordic Institute of Maritime Law at the University of Oslo, or the Nordic Domestic Science Academy.

Among the most topical projects in higher education is an expansion of the possibility for university studies in other Nordic countries, including the reciprocal recognition of examinations. The report regrets that the work done in this field has not led to any noticeable increase in the number of university students availing themselves of their opportunities. To encourage the greater use of existing facilities, the section in 1963 brought out a publication giving information about *University Studies in the Nordic Countries*. A second edition appeared in 1967 and a third, revised, edition in 1972.

The section succeeded in initiating a series of Nordic university courses using joint educational material and curricula. Money has now been made available from national budgets to finance annual courses in Nordic languages, literature and history.

On the initiative of the section the Nordic Summer School for post-graduate students was initiated in 1967, and financed by the Nordic Cultural Fund for an experimental period. The aim of the courses is to supplement national training of research personnel, to consider new theoretical or methodological problems in various disciplines, or to impart highly specialised knowledge. The section had discovered a need to provide additional post-graduate training, both in the administrative and the research fields, aimed at finding solutions to the recently recognised problem of lifelong education. Other initiatives of the section have included the preparation and organisation of a high-level conference of persons from all the Nordic universities held in 1971 at Lysebu, Oslo, to consider university pedagogical research and development work; co-operation in the use of audio-visual material in university questions, including problems of copyright; courses in Finnish for civil servants and research personnel to make Finnish sources of information more accessible; and the establishment of an assistant professorship in contemporary Nordic history at University College, London.

In conclusion the report of the section draws attention to the practical and technical problems confronting both individuals and institutes in working for closer co-operation in research and suggests the need for a better organisation under the new Nordic Cultural Agreement to find more effective solutions to these problems.

The contribution to the Testament of the second section, dealing with education below the university level, enumerates a number of current projects which, in its opinion, should be maintained under the new dispensation to be inaugurated by the Nordic Cultural Agreement. The most important of these, on which work started in 1947, was the harmonisation of school systems and curricula in the Nordic countries. A beginning had been made with harmonising the syllabus for mathematics and for English: it was hoped that this work might create patterns which could be followed in other subjects, for which a system of priorities needed to be established.

In 1968 the section appointed a group of experts who were, in co-operation with a similar group of experts set up by the first section, to work out proposals for methods of co-operation in the use and development on a Nordic basis of audio-visual material. In this context the Nordic Cultural Commission, at its last plenary meeting in 1971, adopted a recommendation to the governments on the pedagogical points of view that needed to be safeguarded when amendments came to be made to the laws of copyright.

In 1969 the section gave attention to the problems of school democracy, or pupil participation. Parents, pupils, teachers and administrators were all showing a keen interest in this matter, which was made the subject of a seminar organised in the autumn of 1971.

Pedagogical questions had received only modest attention in the first few years of existence of the Nordic Cultural Commission. With the reorganisation of 1954, work in this field was intensified. In that year a permanent expert committee for pedagogical research and development was set up and attached to the second section. In 1967 it was replaced by a Nordic Committee for Pedagogical Research (with many of the same members). The committee has arranged annual Nordic symposia on special questions, and has initiated a Nordic bibliography of pedagogical research.

Here it is appropriate to make mention of the Nordic Folk High Schools, which straddle the interests of the second and third sections of the Nordic Cultural Commission, though formally falling within the competence of the second section.

An idea of the nineteenth century, the Folk High Schools are residential non-vocational schools, with a regular six-months' winter course and several shorter courses or seminars during the summer season. They are regarded as a part of the general educational system, though each school is independent in its activities. Traditionally the Folk High Schools have had Nordic co-operation not as a marginal, but as an intrinsic part of their activities. It was natural that co-operation in this field of education should figure on the agenda both of the Ministers of Education and of the Nordic Cultural Commission.

An interesting feature of the system is the existence of two Nordic Folk High Schools abroad. That at Geneva was established in 1931, with the aim of providing education in international and Nordic problems. The course includes lectures on political, economic and social subjects, and is generally preceded by preparatory courses in one of the Nordic countries. A British-Scandinavian Folk High School was established in Manchester in 1947. There courses of three months are organised by the Workers' Educational Associations of the Nordic countries and of the United Kingdom. The purpose of the courses is to give young people from the Nordic countries some knowledge of English life and social institutions.

5. The most substantial contribution to the Testament comes from the third section, which covered the most heterogeneous activities of the Nordic Cultural Commission such as adult education, youth work, literature, music, theatre and ballet, pictorial art, film, radio and television, libraries, museums — in fact, cultural activities in general. The third section was that one which above all could only operate through direct contact between civil servants and professional people. As a result it established close relations with non-governmental organisations of many kinds, and in particular with the Norden associations, to which it pays special tribute. In various fields the section was responsible for bringing about institutionalised Nordic co-operation among national organisations.

Adult education and youth work occupied a great deal of the section's attention. It produced numerous reports on co-operation in these fields, and recommended that a Nordic centre for research in adult education, training of teachers for adult education, and documentation on this subject should be set up in each of the countries. It laid particular emphasis on the importance of giving help to voluntary organisations and enabling them to participate actively, in an independent capacity, in Nordic co-operation within the fields of their interest and expertise.

In this context, the section saw fruitful possibilities in the promotion of travelling exhibitions. It decided in 1969 to investigate the possibility of extending the activities of the Swedish experimental institute "Travelling Exhibitions" into a Nordic co-operative body. An interim Nordic "Exhibition Council" was appointed, of members from each country representing national committees drawn from museums, libraries, popular education organisations and the Norden associations. The object was to promote exhibitions of a general educational character, providing well-documented material for use by study circles or discussion groups in voluntary organisations. The section recommended that the Nordic Cultural Fund should be asked to subsidise the experiment for a trial period.

Another objective of the section has been to promote the long-discussed common Nordic book market. In spite of the ready comprehensibility of one another's languages, the Nordic peoples have shown a marked disinclination to buy one another's books. It is evident that a single market for the writings of Nordic authors would be to the advantage of authors, publishers and Nordic literature alike.

In 1956 the Nordic Cultural Commission asked the governments to create fellowships to Nordic literary critics for studies in neighbouring countries; to give grants to smaller public libraries to buy books from the other Nordic countries; and to help finance projects sponsored by the Norden associations to promote mutual knowledge of the languages of neighbouring countries. All these recommendations were acted upon by the governments.

On the initiative of the Nordic Council, the Ministers of Education in 1959 asked the Nordic Cultural Commission to make further efforts to encourage the development of a common Nordic book market. The commission was able to discover certain encouraging trends: customs barriers were being reduced; technical literature was widely circulated among the five countries; Nordic publishers were co-operating in certain fields, particularly in that of illustrated editions. But the Nordic peoples continued to show unwillingness to read books written in one another's languages. It would take patient and persistent work at many levels to change this — by schools, libraries, universities and, perhaps above all, radio and television. The third section was able to persuade the Norden associations to set up Nordic book committees in each country, consisting of writers, publishers, librarians, teachers and representatives of the Norden associations. These committees submitted a proposal of a "Nordic library" — a joint edition of literary paperbacks, sponsored by the Norden associations. The Nordic Cultural Commission adopted the proposal in 1968 and recommended it for support by the Nordic Cultural Fund. This support had not been given by the time the Nordic Cultural Commission disappeared in 1971.

Another proposal of the section in this field met with more rapid success. Four Nordic publishers undertook to co-operate in publishing a series of paperbacks on topical questions designed to stimulate a debate across the borders. The Nordic Cultural Fund agreed to support the project for a trial period of three years.

The first step towards Nordic co-operation in the world of the theatre was taken in 1937 with the meeting of the first Nordic theatre conference in Stockholm. After the war, contacts were resumed in

1946, and led to the foundation of the Nordic Theatre Union. On the initiative of the third section of the Nordic Cultural Commission, grants were given from the Nordic Cultural Fund to the Union's international activities.

In 1947 the Nordic Cultural Commission initiated the establishment of the Nordic Theatre Directors' Council, and on a recommendation of the commission the Ministers of Education agreed in 1954 to find 30 000 Norwegian kroner as an annual grant. The commission was asked to work out rules for the use of this money, which was to be made available within the country where it was granted to support theatres wishing to sponsor performances from the other Nordic countries. In 1966 the commission pointed out that the money was far from adequate, and asked for a substantial increase, giving details of how the larger sums should be spent. The governments rejected this plea: whereupon the Nordic Cultural Fund asked the third section of the commission to work out a comprehensive plan for the development of Nordic theatre co-operation.

The outcome was a greatly increased measure of co-operation, subsidised by the Fund to the amount of 250 000 Danish kroner a year: after a time the annual grant was increased to 550 000 Danish kroner. The third section's activities in the world of the theatre also resulted in government grants being given for the holding of annual seminars for the further training of producers.

Co-operation among the seven Nordic opera houses has also been brought about, in the form of regular meetings of their artistic and administrative directors. An opera or musical drama by a Nordic composer is now commissioned every year. This activity has been supported by the Nordic Cultural Fund since 1970.

Nordic contact in the field of music was organised non-governmentally after the first world war. In 1955 the third section of the Nordic Cultural Commission proposed that this co-operation should be supported from national budgets. Four of the five governments acted on this proposal. At a later stage grants from the Nordic Cultural Fund made it possible to finance the commissioning of works by Nordic composers.

Nordic co-operation in the field of film, radio and television has been a long-standing preoccupation of the third section. Recommendations for the furthering of such co-operation are included in the Testament. The section also gave its attention to the promotion of art and design. A number of achievements stand to its credit in this field. A plan for the purchase of works of contemporary art from all five countries, worked out by the section, is now being considered by the new Nordic Cultural Secretariat.

The idea of presenting Nordic achievements in the arts as evidence of the cultural and spiritual unity of the five countries in their relations with the outer world was among the ideas pursued by the third section. It may well be that this idea will be pursued with greater vigour under the new structure set up by the Nordic Cultural Agreement of 1971.

6. The year 1949 had seen the breakdown of negotiations for a Scandinavian Defence Alliance, which the Swedes wanted to be an alliance neutral as between the two great power blocs. Denmark and Norway on the other hand preferred to seek security within the North Atlantic Treaty Organisation, as also did Iceland. Finland was in treaty relationship with the USSR and Sweden stuck firmly to her traditional neutrality. It was in the aftermath of this underlining of differentiation in defence policy that the Nordic Council came into existence in 1952.

Then, in 1959, came the breakdown of the proposed Nordic Market, and the formation of the European Free Trade Association, which was joined by Denmark, Norway and Sweden. (Finland later, and Iceland much later, concluded association agreements with EFTA.) It was shortly after the breakdown of the proposed Nordic Market that the decision was taken to conclude a Nordic Co-operation Treaty (the Helsinki Agreement), which was signed in 1962.

In 1967 Denmark, Norway and Sweden applied for membership of the European Economic Community. President de Gaulle's (second) veto of the British application in that same year put an end to negotiations, and the Nordic governments worked out a plan for closer economic co-operation among themselves, generally described as the Nordek plan. Simultaneously, plans for more intensive cultural co-operation among the Nordic countries were under consideration; and so were plans for making the work of the Nordic Council more effective.

The Nordek plan broke down. But the plans for making the work of the Nordic Council more effective led to a revision of the Nordic Co-operation Treaty: a revised Helsinki Agreement was signed in 1971. The same year saw the conclusion of a new treaty devoted entirely to Nordic cultural co-operation: the Nordic Cultural Agreement, signed in Helsinki on 15 March 1971. Before the end of the year the agreement had been ratified by all five parliaments: it entered into force on 1 January 1972.

The revised Nordic Co-operation Treaty strengthened the position of the Nordic Council, which now became the parliamentary counterpart of a Nordic Council of Ministers. This served among other things to formalise contacts between the governments on the one hand, represented by the Council of Ministers, and on the other hand the Nordic Council's Cultural Committee. Against this background the new Nordic Cultural Agreement was able to create machinery for a far more powerful instrument of cultural co-operation than had existed hitherto. A feature of this new instrument was the disappearance of the Nordic Cultural Commission, which had itself played an important part in working out the plans for the new instrument which were given expression in the new agreement.

By the terms of Article 1 "This treaty aims at strengthening and intensifying cultural co-operation in a wide sense between the Contracting Parties in order to develop further the Nordic cultural community and to increase the combined effect of the countries' investments in education, research and other cultural activities through common planning, co-ordination, co-operation and distribution of work, and at creating the practical preconditions for efficient co-operation".

To this inward-looking aim is added an outward-looking aim in Article 2, which states that "This treaty also has the aim of creating a basis for a co-ordinated contribution in international cultural co-operation".

There follow five articles devoted to the scope of activities, in which a comprehensive programme of educational and cultural co-operation is spelt out in detail. This programme, devoted mainly to listing the fields in which the aim of Article 1 is to be achieved, also looks forward to "common representation in international connections within those areas covered within this treaty" and provides for co-operation in spreading information on the cultural life of the Nordic countries and achieving a common or co-ordinated attitude in international cultural co-operation. Thus is the aim of Article 2 followed up: more specifically: "Decisions may be reached concerning common representation in connection with participation in international cultural co-operation".

The machinery of co-operation is described in the next half-dozen articles. Briefly, co-operation is to take place "through the Nordic Ministerial Council", which "shall take such decisions as are required to implement the aims of the treaty". This co-operation is also "to take place under the aegis of the Nordic Council". The executive organ is to be a Committee of Officials and a Secretariat for Nordic Cultural Co-operation, headed by a Director to be appointed by the Ministerial Council.

Then follow five articles spelling out how co-operation under the treaty is to be financed. The Nordic Council is to be given an opportunity of discussion before budget proposals have been framed: the Ministerial Council is to "prepare and decide concerning budget proposals"; these proposals are to be submitted to the five governments; and when the money has been granted the Ministerial Council is to decide the final allocations.

The spirit of the treaty is well conveyed by Article 14, which states that "Each Contracting Party should, in the Ministerial Council, in other ministerial meetings or in the Committee of Officials, consult together with other Contracting Parties before reaching any decision of substantial importance in areas covered by this treaty".

7. The Nordic Cultural Agreement of 1971 is the fruit of close on a quarter of a century of experience of collective cultural diplomacy practised by the five Nordic governments, principally through the agency of the Nordic Cultural Commission. This long period of experiment had served to identify the principal areas in which co-operation could be fruitfully pursued, had brought officials into meaningful contact with non-official persons in the worlds of education and culture, and had led to a number of positive achievements. It had also made it plain that there must inevitably be severe limitations on cultural co-operation if the planning and execution of this co-operation was to be left to persons whose participation in the Nordic Cultural Commission was only a part-time activity, taking second place after their primary tasks of administration or university teaching, or whatever their basic occupation might be. The machinery which had been put together experimentally and progressively since the second world war was not capable of carrying the load of work which the governments now wished to place upon it. But the fashioning and running of this machinery over a period of all but a quarter of a century had shown the governments what they must put in its place to do what they now wanted.

It must be borne in mind that most of the Nordic governments for the greater part of this time, and finally all of them, were also taking part in the system of collective cultural co-operation, which will shortly be examined, instituted within the wider framework of the European Cultural Convention. The framers of the Nordic Cultural Agreement were able to draw on this experience also in creating their own new machinery.

The top level of co-operation was to be a Nordic Ministerial Council. This Council has no supranational powers. But the five governments have charged it with the reponsibility of taking "such decisions as are required to implement the aims of the treaty". In this context it is important to note that, in the framework of the Nordic Cultural Agreement, the Ministerial Council is a Council of Ministers of Education and Cultural Affairs. We shall see later how this differs from the wider system of co-operation in which the Nordic governments participate with many other European governments under the European Cultural Convention.

The Nordic Ministerial Council has its parliamentary partner in the Nordic Council which, for its part, has decided to make of its Cultural Committee the organ of co-operation with the Ministerial Council in cultural matters. The Cultural Committee therefore has the right to discuss budgetary proposals before a decision on these is taken by the Ministerial Council.

So far, the top level of the machinery of cultural co-operation amounts to little more than a formalisation and strengthening of existing practice. The real innovation comes in replacing the very part-time Nordic Cultural Commission, whose membership was partly official and partly non-official, with a Committee of Officials, one appointed by each of the five governments, and a full-time secretariat, under a Director appointed by the Ministerial Council. Copenhagen has been chosen as the site of the Secretariat for Nordic Cultural Co-operation. It is there that the Committee of Officials meets, normally once a month, to prepare the work of the Ministerial Council and carry out other tasks submitted to it by the Council.

The Committee of Officials has been provided with three advisory committees. The Advisory Committee for Education has eighteen members, and the Union of Norden Associations may send an observer to its meetings. The Advisory Committee for Research has fourteen members. The Advisory Committee for General Cultural Activities has twenty members, including one from the Union of Norden Associations.

In addition to the three permanent advisory committees, it is foreseen that other advisory groups or working groups may be appointed to help the Committee of Officials, and other independent committees or groups drawn from existing cultural organisations may be called upon for advice. Some of the working groups set up by the Nordic Cultural Commission have been asked to continue their work for the benefit of the Committee of Officials, and the secretariat is engaged in seeing how the "Testament of the Nordic Cultural Commission" may, where appropriate, be put into effect.

Such then is the new machinery of Nordic cultural diplomacy. It is to operate in three distinct fields: education, research, and other cultural activities. The article in the Nordic Cultural Agreement relating to education includes all levels and all kinds of education, from primary education to post-graduate specialised education, and education in the language, culture and social conditions of the other Nordic countries. Co-operation is to be directed to the objectives, content and means of education, the structure of the educational system, and pedagogical development work. If the programme laid down is carried fully into effect, the result should be a single Nordic educational community at all levels.

In the field of research, co-operation should aim at joint plans for exploiting resources. Existing measures of co-operation are to be maintained, and further measures introduced whereby expensive or highly specialised apparatus can be exploited to the benefit of all.

Other cultural activities are widely and flexibly interpreted. Co-operation is to be directed towards general cultural policy and is to cover the institutional, organisational and financial conditions of cultural activities. These include the arts, archives, libraries, museums, radio and television, film and other forms of cultural dissemination.

In the new framework of Nordic collective cultural diplomacy, substantial sums are likely to be made available under the new budgetary system. The activities so financed are however intended to supplement, not to displace, the efforts of non-governmental organisations. It remains to be seen how the Nordic Cultural Fund will fare under the new dispensation. A half-governmental, half-parliamentary institution, this official fund, supporting and encouraging unofficial projects, has convincingly proved its worth. It could profitably continue to act as the promoter of initiatives and innovations, provided the governments, now controlling a more massive machine of collective cultural diplomacy, do not allow this valuable instrument to die of inanition.

The Nordic Cultural Agreement entered into force on 1 January 1972. Its working will no doubt intensify the cohesion of the five Nordic delegations which, operating at Strasbourg within the wider framework of the European Cultural Convention, are able to represent not only their several countries separately, but the cultural community of the Nordic states as a whole.

Note to Chapter VII

Texts are quoted from Lyche.

VIII.

THE BRUSSELS TREATY FIVE

1. We have just seen how cultural co-operation among the five Nordic countries grew up immediately after the second world war, but was not conventionalised until the signature of the Helsinki Agreement of 1962. Among the five signatories of the Brussels Treaty of 1948, on the other hand, collective cultural co-operation was instituted in order to give effect to an article of the treaty.

The substance of the treaty which the Foreign Ministers of Belgium, France, Luxembourg, the Netherlands and the United Kingdom signed at Brussels on 17 March 1948 was an undertaking to assist one another, within the framework of the Charter of the United Nations, in the event of any of them becoming the object of an armed attack in Europe, with Germany specified as the potential aggressor. But the first three articles of the treaty are concerned with co-operation respectively in economic, social and cultural matters; the treaty is officially described as a "Treaty of Economic, Social and Cultural Collaboration and Collective Self-Defence"; and in its preamble the five heads of state express their resolve "To reaffirm their faith in fundamental human rights, in the dignity and worth of the human person and in the other ideals proclaimed in the Charter of the United Nations"; and "To fortify the principles of democracy, personal freedom and political liberty, the constitutional traditions and the rule of law, which are their common heritage".

Cultural co-operation is made the subject of Article III of the treaty, which reads: "The High Contracting Parties will make every effort in common to lead their peoples towards a better understanding of the principles which form the basis of their common civilisation and to promote cultural exchanges by conventions between themselves and by other means".

Towards the end of 1954, the five-power Brussels Treaty Organisation underwent a significant evolution. The Brussels Treaty of 1948 had contained an expression of the resolve of the signatories "To take such steps as may be held to be necessary in the event of a renewal by Germany of a policy of aggression". The Paris Protocol of 1954, which set up Western European Union, was signed not only by the original five, but by the Governments of Italy and of the Federal German Republic as well. The former allies of the second world war were no longer preoccupied with uniting against their former enemies. In Western European Union all were equal partners in a seven-power alliance.

The present chapter is devoted to an examination of how the five signatories of the Brussels Treaty interpreted its cultural clause (Article III) up to the time when the Brussels Treaty Organisation was superseded by Western European Union. The next chapter will be concerned with the evolution of collective cultural co-operation within the seven-power union. But even cumulatively the story told in these two chapters ends on an unresolved chord. The cultural work of Western European Union modulated into a different key when, in 1960, it was transposed into that of the Council of Europe. This transposition was a very indirect and unforeseen consequence of a decision taken by the Consultative Council (of Foreign Ministers) of the original Brussels Treaty Organisation so far back as January 1949. At its fourth meeting held in that month in London, the Consultative Council agreed that there should be established a Council of Europe, consisting of a ministerial committee meeting in private and a consultative body meeting in public. Other European countries were to be invited to take part in the negotiations for the establishment of the Council of Europe, which was duly set up on 5 May 1949, with Strasbourg chosen to be its headquarters.

In August 1948, within five months of the signature of the Brussels Treaty, an ad hoc committee of cultural advisers, convened by the Secretary General of the Brussels Treaty Organisation on the instructions of that organisation's Consultative Council, met in London. These cultural advisers were drawn in part from Ministries of Foreign Affairs, in part from Ministries of Education (with a representative of the British Council included in the delegation of the United Kingdom). Their task was to examine the whole picture of cultural relations among the five countries, and to decide what action could usefully be taken, either within the framework of the treaty or bilaterally, with a view to promoting, in the cultural field, the realisation of Western Union.

Two months later, in October, the cultural advisers held a second meeting in Paris. By the time of their third meeting, held at The Hague in March 1949, they had been given the status of a permanent committee under the Brussels Treaty. This was to become known as the Cultural Committee. During a period of some six years, the Cultural Committee held fifteen sessions. A feature of the Brussels Treaty Organisation was that its committees were peripatetic: they met in each of the five member countries in turn. Delegates were required to speak in either English or French; in whichever of these two official languages they chose to speak, it was necessary for them to know the other also, for there was no interpretation.

The two additional Members of Western European Union were present when the Cultural Committee held its sixteenth session in London in the spring of 1955. It continued to meet, with Bonn and Rome now added to its places of meeting, for five more years. For purposes of convenience and economy, one of the two annual meetings was now held in Strasbourg, whither the members of the committee would in any case have to travel to attend meetings of the Committee of Cultural Experts of the Council of Europe. In the spring of 1960 the committee, together with its secretariat, made Strasbourg its headquarters and regular meeting-place. Thereafter, as we shall see in due course, the cultural work of Western European Union was to be taken over by the Council of Europe and integrated into the Council of Europe's own cultural work.

The founder members of the Cultural Committee were pioneers of collective cultural co-operation, and the records suggest that in their first few years of feverish activity they had little idea of what they were supposed to be trying to achieve. The committee had been created to carry out a treaty commitment of five governments "to lead their peoples towards a better understanding of the principles which form the basis of their common civilisation". What were the drafters of the treaty dreaming of, and what was the meaning of their dream? Were they not in fact following the precedent of Nebuchadnezzar, who expected his wise men not only to tell him what his dream portended, but actually to divine what it was that he had dreamed? Nebuchadnezzar's wise men were not up to the task. But Daniel was. In its Cultural Committee, the Consultative Council of the Brussels Treaty Organisation found a Daniel of its own.

2. The implementation of Article III of the Brussels Treaty was set in motion when, at its second meeting, held at The Hague in July 1948, the Consultative Council adopted a resolution which implied that an intensification of bilateral co-operation among the "cultural, educational and other organisations of the five powers" would, for the time being, prove "preferable to action through a single five-power body attempting to cover the whole field". Herein they were re-affirming the opinion expressed by M. Hoste's Commission of CAME which considered the nature of cultural conventions, as described in Chapter II. Paradoxically, however, the Consultative Council at the same time "agreed to summon an early meeting of our expert advisers who will report the results of their discussions to the Permanent Commission".

Hence the meeting, in August 1948, of the ad hoc committee of cultural advisers, which made its recommendations to the Permanent Commission, a committee of ambassadors acting under the authority of, and with powers delegated by, the Consultative Council of Foreign Ministers. What was soon to be institutionalised as the Cultural Committee was therefore throughout its existence an advisory body, which technically had no powers of decision. But in practice the Consultative Council, and more immediately the Permanent Commission, tended to accept the recommendations of the Cultural Committee. It is fair therefore to regard the Cultural Committee, a body of permanent officials drawn from Ministries of Foreign Affairs and Ministries of Education, as both the interpreters and executants of Article III of the Brussels Treaty.

The Cultural Committee set about its task with vigour and initiative. In June 1949, after four meetings of the committee and several meetings of expert working parties convened to study specific proposals, the Secretary General was able to submit to the Consultative Council a report on one year of co-operation in the cultural sphere which covered resolutions drafted by the Cultural Committee; achievements to date; and subjects under study.

Three of the resolutions, relating to the free circulation of books and periodicals among the five countries, to the acquisition of contemporary works of art, and to methods of financing cultural activities resulting from the application of Article III, had already been approved by the Permanent Commission, which still had under consideration two further resolutions dealing with radio and television.

Under the heading "achievements in cultural co-operation to date" the Secretary General was able to report that plans had been made for the holding of three separate series of five-power courses. The first series was for the benefit of educational inspectors from the five countries: the first course in this series had been held a few weeks previously in the United Kingdom; it had proved a great success, and was to be followed by a second course in France in 1950. The second series was destined for teachers; fifty teachers from the five countries were to attend the first of these courses in the United Kingdom in a few weeks' time. The second course would be organised in 1950 by the French Government. The first course in the third series, intended for government officials, would be held in London in the autumn of 1949; France would be the host to the second course in this series.

To what he described as a Sub-Committee on Youth the Secretary General was able to credit: *a.* a simplification of formalities with regard to passports for school groups, and for other groups of young persons travelling at a reduced price; *b.* the setting up of a provisional secretariat in the Ministry of Public Instruction in Brussels, and the establishment of centralising bodies in each country to co-ordinate the organised group-travel of young persons; *c.* the organisation, in each country, of some form of youth manifestation during 1949; *d.* the organisation of a radio festival for young people; *e.* the collection of documentation leading to the publication of a pamphlet listing youth hostel accommodation in the five countries; *f.* the study of possibilities of travel for young people at a reduced cost.

Among subjects under study by the Cultural Committee, the Secretary General listed:

- the equivalence of qualifications allowing access to higher education;
- the creation of a "cultural identity card";
- exchanges of reproductions of works of art;
- problems of student employees;
- five-power co-operation in the field of newsreels and non-commercial films;
- a joint exhibition of educational material.

Mention has been made of the decision to hold a series of courses for teachers from the five countries. The first of these courses was organised at Ashridge in 1949, the second at Sèvres in 1950 and the third at Oosterbeek in 1951. "Those taking part endeavoured to define the principles informing their common civilisation and to determine the extent to which it would be desirable to embody them more fully in their teaching."[1] This endeavour resulted in the publication, in three languages, of a report by Professor Pierre Joulia, of Paris, entitled *The Civilisation of Western Europe and the School.*

The "brochure Joulia" (as it came to be known) is a slender affair divided into two parts, an exposition of principles, and suggestions for teachers. In the conclusion M. Joulia declares that "all the ideas presented in the preceding pages have been tried in the fire of common discussion". It was this fact which made of *The Civilisation of Western Europe and the School* a pioneering achievement in giving effect to Article III of the Brussels Treaty, wherein the five governments undertook to "make every effort in common to lead their peoples towards a better understanding of the principles which form the basis of their common civilisation".

In the next couple of years of the Cultural Committee's existence (after the approval by the Consultative Council of the Secretary General's report on one year of co-operation in the cultural sphere), a number of its working parties of specialists were accorded the status of sub-committees. Some of these – on works of art, on television, on newsreels – had only an ephemeral existence. One, set up to organise the series of courses for government officials, after some years as a sub-committee of the Committee of Cultural Experts, achieved its independence and was upgraded into a Public Administration Committee, directly responsible to the Council of Western European Union, which had by then superseded the Brussels Treaty Organisation. Of the work of the Youth Sub-Committee and of the Non-Commercial Cinema Sub-Committee more will be said. Here mention must be made of the success story of the Sub-Committee on the Cultural Identity Card, which met for the first time in June 1949. By the end of 1953, this sub-committee had met eight times and had done its work so effectively that the Brussels Treaty Organisation had become too small a framework for its continuance.

The Cultural Identity Card was originally intended to enable a small body of persons – genuine research workers – to overcome the difficulties of post-war travel by being given special governmental facilities. Slowly the post-war travel difficulties disappeared, but meanwhile the cultural aspect of the exercise developed a life of its own. The five governments decided what privileges each was prepared to give to persons certified by one of the other member governments as genuine research students. It was soon recognised that conditions in each country varied so much that there could be no question of standardising these privileges. The Cultural Identity Card Sub-Committee nevertheless succeded in working out a system whereby the qualifications for obtaining a Cultural Identity Card were standardised; an issuing authority was appointed in each country; and the facilities granted in each country to the holders of these cards coming from other countries were agreed by all.

In 1950 the Consultative Assembly of the Council of Europe recommended that the Brussels Treaty Organisation's Cultural Identity Card scheme should be extended to member states of the Council of Europe. This was done by stages: in 1952 five Members of the Council of Europe were admitted to the scheme, in addition to the five Members of the Brussels Treaty Organisation. Finally, on 1 June 1954, the administration of the Cultural Identity Card was transferred from the Brussels Treaty Organisation to the Council of Europe.

3. Having, at its first meeting, identified the cinema as a medium through which part of its work of cultural co-operation should be carried out, the Cultural Committee at its third meeting proposed the creation of a sub-committee to study the question of entertainment films for adults and children. At its fourth meeting it worked out terms of reference for this sub-committee, which was to have four specific aims. One aim was the exchange of documentary films among the five countries; a second the exchange of information and the development of co-operation between specialist groups interested in the use of films (educational films being singled out as of special importance); a third the promotion of the production of films on the theme of Western civilisation; and the fourth the establishment of a central film library, at least of educational and scientific films, for each country.

Six weeks later, at the beginning of July 1949, the Non-Commercial Cinema Sub-Committee (as it eventually came to be called) held a three-day meeting. Like its parent Cultural Committee, it was undertaking pioneer work. Its efforts resulted in a remarkable body of achievement right up to the time of the transfer of cultural co-operation from Western European Union to the Council of Europe. Thereafter the sub-committee was, as we shall see in due course, to have a chequered career for several more years before finally being axed at the end of 1967.

At the sub-committee's first meeting, a detailed statement was made by a member of each delegation on the organisation of the production and distribution of non-commercial films in his own country. After this important exercise in international enlightenment, an exchange of views took place about the compilation of a catalogue of non-commercial films in each country, with a view to the eventual production of a joint catalogue. This led on, logically enough, to a discussion of existing possibilities for the exchange of films among the countries represented, and to the desirability of appointing or establishing a central distribution agency in each country.

From plans for the exchange of information on non-commercial films, the sub-committee then went on to consider the possibilities for joint production. At its second meeting, in October 1949, the sub-committee ventured upon the delicate matter of arriving at an agreed definition, valid in all member countries, of the term "non-commercial". It also embarked on the problem of removing customs dues and simplifying customs formalities, and on the question of copyright. While continuing to discuss the organisation of exchanges of films among the five countries, the sub-committee decided to make a beginning with some actual exchanges. It also decided that the best way to bring about an exchange of experience between production specialists was to set them to work on the co-production of a film on landscape painting.

The third meeting, in April 1950, showed that delegates to the Non-Commercial Cinema Sub-Committee were not content to meet, discuss and draft recommendations. Their recommendations were directed at obtaining support in high quarters for the negotiations that they themselves were conducting, each in his own country, with financial authorities, customs authorities and film production bodies. Films were now regularly being exchanged between delegations for non-theatrical distribution.

By the time the Brussels Treaty Organisation was expanded into Western European Union, the sub-committee had held twelve meetings, which were largely devoted to the routine matters of exchanging information on documentary and other non-commercial film production in the five countries; to screening films offered for exchange; and to organising the distribution in each country of non-commercial films produced in the others.

In addition to these now routine activities, the sub-committee discovered that linguistic difficulties frequently arose over the translation of film jargon from one language to another. It accordingly made plans for the compilation of a trilingual glossary of cinema terminology, and was by 1955 ready to publish this glossary in English, French and Dutch. It gave considerable thought to the effect of television upon the use of film, and noted that, if the commercial cinema was liable to suffer from television as a rival, the documentary film, and particularly the educational film, was offered great new opportunities by the television screen. Most interesting of all, the sub-committee brought to a successful conclusion its project for the co-production of a film on landscape painting, and set on foot a new collective experiment in the production of educational films.

The story of both this project and this experiment is told in a little book published in 1965 by the Council for Cultural Co-operation of the Council of Europe. Of *The Open Window* we are told that

> Landscape painting was a specially important feature of the contribution which Europe had made to the cultural heritage of the world and the film would be a useful reminder of this. Moreover, a film on landscape painting could illustrate in a relatively simple way the process of cultural co-operation which has taken place in Western civilisation. It could show how the artists of each country had developed strong national characteristics which influenced the artists of other countries and how the cross-fertilisation had produced a new and richer community of perception, imagination, emotion and technique. In telling the story of landscape painting in five European countries, the film could suggest that a similar interchange of ideas, methods and styles in many fields was possible and was the essence of natural co-operation among races and nations. The subject seemed rather a timely one and admirably to fulfil the spirit of the cultural co-operation clause of the treaty . . .
>
> Each government agreed to provide free a number of minor facilities and services on its own territory. It was decided, for example, that all the paintings to be photographed in a country would be brought free of transport charges to a single gallery in that country, thus cutting out the costs of moving the production unit from gallery to gallery in different cities.
>
> The main unit which travelled from country to country consisted of nine people . . . Artistic unity was preserved because the chief artists and technicians were working together throughout all the shooting of the film irrespective of where it was taking place. In a period of five weeks nearly sixty paintings were photographed in the various countries . . .
>
> The title *The Open Window* was taken from the first scenes of the film which demonstrated how Renaissance painters had opened windows of the rooms in which they were painting Ma-

> donnas and Saints, to depict the countrysides that were visible through them, thus bringing landscape painting first into European art.

The Open Window was first publicly shown at the Edinburgh Festival in August 1952. Within twelve years, excluding its showings by television, it is reckoned to have been seen by nearly ten million people.

In 1952 the Non-Commercial Cinema Sub-Committee adopted a scheme of co-operation of films for the teaching of physical geography. This time five films were to be made by five countries in a single series.

> By 1959 all five films had been completed ... To date (1965), each film has on average been accepted by six countries. Over 2 000 copies of these five films are now in distribution – an estimated average audience of about 2.5 million.

This brings the story of the Non-Commercial Cinema Sub-Committee down to the point at which it was enlarged by German and Italian participation.

4. The vigour and initiative of the Cultural Committee's Non-Commercial Cinema Sub-Committee was fully matched by those of its Youth Sub-Committee. One of this sub-committee's earliest endeavours was the promotion of the travel by young people from one of the five countries to another, preferably in organised groups. The sub-committee succeeded, by persistent effort, in promoting travel at reduced prices for groups of young people by both rail and air. Moreover its labours resulted in the approval by the Permanent Commission, in February 1952, of an "Arrangement concerning Collective Passports" among the five governments. It also brought out a collective handbook entitled *En route*.[3]

The following extract from the foreword to *En route*, which appeared over the signatures in facsimile of the Ministers of Education of the five countries, illustrates some aspects of the Youth Sub-Committee's philosophy:

> The word "civilisation" has the same meaning in all the five countries. It describes identical moral values which are but slightly varied by local tradition. The ideal which it represents is in its essence universal. While the Brussels Treaty is an endeavour to reinforce the friendly relations between the five countries, it in no way ignores the bonds which unite them to the other peoples of the world.
>
> Young people have a vital role to play in the realisation of this ideal, for it is they who tomorrow will be called upon to build the more united world which is the desire of all.

> To achieve this end they must, however, first get to know each other. Thousands of young people must travel abroad each year opening their eyes and their minds to the wide horizons of the world. They will thus appreciate that the differences which distinguish them in no way contradict the fundamental aspirations which unite them.

The Youth Sub-Committee found that *En route* did not quite fulfil its expectations. It was too detailed and complicated, and therefore not easy for young people to use. So, within the next three years, it produced three separate travel guides: *Coming to Britain, Voir et comprendre la France* and *Voir et comprendre le Bénélux*. Collectively these travel guides, all of them published for the Brussels Treaty Organisation, were thought sufficient to supply the needs of groups of children and young people travelling from one of the Brussels Treaty countries to any of the other four.

Every year the Youth Sub-Committee made a point of organising two or three meetings of groups of young people, or more effectively groups of persons responsible for the guidance of youth, to pursue a joint interest in common. The results of these meetings were carefully analysed, and lessons drawn from mistakes no less than from successes. This regular exercise of drawing conclusions from past courses resulted in a more purposive organisation of future courses, and in a steady improvement in planning aims and in the techniques of execution. By the time that the Brussels Treaty Organisation was expanded into Western European Union, the delegates of the Five had learned not to offer courses unless they felt confident that they would be well organised, nor to agree to the holding of courses unless they were satisfied that they would serve a useful purpose. The sum total of these courses was that young persons recruited from national youth organisations or their leaders or organisers came to learn — as they never had before — from the experiences and the achievements of their opposite numbers in the other Brussels Treaty countries.

The Youth Sub-Committee gave attention to many subjects other than those already mentioned. During 1952 it completed a survey of youth activities in the five countries.[4] It gave thought to trial exchanges of young workers between industrial firms in the five countries; foreign students working to earn their living during their period of study; problems encountered by "au pair" girls; school party travel; and school-linking.

Shortly before the expansion of the Brussels Treaty Organisation into Western European Union, the sub-committee was instructed to establish a programme of its future activities and determine an order of priority to be given to these. The programme which it accordingly proposed was grouped under seven headings: 1. documentation and information; 2. training of youth leaders; 3. visits and educational exchanges; 4. open-air activities — physical education and sports; 5. intellectual and artistic activities; 6. problems of the integration of young people into life outside school; and 7. utilisation of audio-visual and other educational media. Other subjects were "retained for study at future courses".

When the Cultural Committee met in November 1954, it was a foregone conclusion that, by the time of its next meeting in June 1955, Western European Union would have come into being, and this would be the last meeting attended by the delegations of only the original five Brussels Treaty countries. The Cultural Committee considered that the activities of the Youth Sub-Committee could well be extended to the Seven; but, in taking note of the programme proposed by the sub-committee, it felt that "youth matters" was a term which covered a very wide field and that, in consequence, the sub-committee should use the strictest care and discrimination in choosing subjects for study, and ought therefore to decide on the importance and priority of the various programme items.

A new project which was now nearing completion was the preparation of an international song-book. Hitherto, the song-book had been planned as one containing songs from the five countries only. The Youth Sub-Committee readily agreed to extend the procedure already established among the five countries to enable German and Italian songs to be included also.

5. If the Cultural Committee of the original five Brussels Treaty powers was successful in pioneering (and carrying into effect through sub-committees of specialists) such original ideas as the Cultural Identity Card, the co-production of non-commercial films, and various methods of inducing young people to think and act across national frontiers, it was in the wide spaces of educational co-operation that its ploughing and sowing were destined to prove the most effective. Here growth became more noticeable among the seven countries which participated in the work from 1955 onwards; and it was not until after the transfer of the work to the Council of Europe in 1960, and more particularly after the Council for Cultural Co-operation had come into being in 1962, that the importance and the scope of this work began to be understood by an increasing number of the non-communist governments of Europe. But it was in the small Cultural Committee of five nations that the ideas were first developed, and the techniques tried out, whose application was in the fulness of time to make of the Council for Cultural Co-operation the executive partner of a non-institutionalised Conference of European Ministers of Education in what might well be looked upon as the nucleus of a Ministry of Education for Europe.*

---

* This idea is developed in a book by the author entitled **A Ministry of Education for Europe** (London, Harrap, 1970).

We have already seen how, as early as 1949, the Cultural Committee succeded in bringing about the first of a series of courses for educational inspectors, and the first of a series of courses for teachers. In the same year it turned its attention to promoting the use of films for educational purposes (which was to become one of the concerns of the Non-Commercial Cinema Sub-Committee), and to working for the equivalence of qualifications in the five countries allowing access to higher education. These, with other more ephemeral ideas of educational co-operation, were the beginnings of what was to become the Cultural Committee's major contribution to the practice of collective cultural co-operation.

The problem of obtaining recognition, within the educational system of a given country, of the qualifications at various levels awarded by the educational systems of other countries, has plagued not only the Mixed Commissions set up under bilateral cultural conventions, but numerous multilateral organisations concerned with some aspect of educational co-operation. It has proved to be one of the most intractable of problems. The Brussels Treaty Cultural Committee approached the problem in a very pragmatic manner, trying to discover where equivalences had already been achieved bilaterally. The objective was to encourage further such bilateral recognitions, and discover whether any of them could be extended to more, and if possible to all, of the five countries. The first draft of a synoptic table of equivalences already achieved was completed in a few weeks. Meanwhile the committee took a first look at two Belgian proposals, one designed to lead to a collective recognition of social diplomas, the other to the study of *effectus civilis* (the right to practise a profession in one country on the strength of a professional qualification gained in another).

Simultaneously the Committee of Cultural Experts of the Council of Europe was tackling the problems of equivalences from a different angle, by drafting a European Convention on the Equivalence of Diplomas leading to Admission to Universities. This convention was signed in 1953; whereupon the Committee of Cultural Experts of the Council of Europe turned its attention to drafting a further equivalence convention. Meanwhile the Council of Europe committee had been seized by the Belgian delegation of the problem of *effectus civilis*. The Brussels Treaty Cultural Committee nevertheless continued to retain both equivalences and *effectus civilis* on its agenda. The moving spirit in this matter was the late Julien Kuypers, then Secretary General of the Belgian Ministry of Education, who was convinced that the subjects demanded international study aimed at international progress, and that it was no duplication for a smaller group of countries to work for the rapid application among themselves of objectives which were pursued, at a more theoretical level, within a larger group also.

The pursuit of *effectus civilis* was, at the end of 1953, recognised by the Cultural Committee as having run into insurmountable obstacles, and the subject was dropped. The question of social diplomas was found intractable at the same time. A year later the Cultural Committee recognised that practical results in the matter of equivalences had only been achieved on the bilateral level and that the proper framework for multilateral discussions on the subject was now the Council of Europe.

In matters of education the Cultural Committee was reluctant to delegate its responsibilities to sub-committees of experts, though in March 1952 a body described in its report as the "Education Sub-Committee" met in Brussels on the initiative and under the chairmanship of M. Kuypers. The five delegations mustered a total of sixteen delegates, drawn from Ministries of Education and from educational inspectorates. The meeting was a fact-finding affair, and exchanged information on the present position in each country on a number of educational matters.

The Cultural Committee found the results of the meeting of great value. It decided that the next course for inspectors of technical education should end with a detailed discussion of the comparative organisation of technical education in the five countries. It also agreed that the desired exchanges of information could be profitably promoted by meetings of senior officials of the Ministries of Education to deal with specific points, and to facilitate the practical application of measures adopted in common; and by meetings of specialists in well-defined fields who were familiar with all that was being done in their own countries with regard to certain aspects of education which the Cultural Committee spelt out.

A certain amount of study was organised by the Cultural Committee of the educational uses of television; but when it found that Unesco was undertaking similar studies on a larger scale, the Cultural Committee decided not to pursue its own study of the matter.

In the course of the stocktaking which the Cultural Committee undertook at its fifteenth meeting in November 1954 — the last before it became a committee of the seven-power Western European Union – its members "felt that the Brussels Treaty teachers' courses had been one of the most fruitful aspects of their co-operation and saw no difficulty in extending them to include the two acceding countries". The committee recognised the value of the educational inspectors' courses also, and felt that these could equally be extended to the Seven. With both types of course, it was important that the subjects should be thought out well in advance and carefully coordinated, if the best results were to be achieved. Out of what had originally been two interesting experiments, an instrument was slowly being forged which could be used in the application of a policy of collective action with a common purpose.

6. It was during the first two years of the Cultural Committee's existence that Dr H. T. Reinink, then Secretary General of the Ministry of Education, Arts and Sciences of the Netherlands and leader of the Netherlands delegation, took an initiative which was to have far-reaching consequences for the future pattern of educational co-operation among European countries. There were plans afoot for a complete reform of higher education in his country. A founder-member of the Cultural Committee and an enthusiast for the principle of cultural co-operation among nations, Dr Reinink was quick to realise that cultural co-operation among the five countries of the Brussels Treaty could be, and ought to be, a great deal more than an exercise by officials to give effect to a policy decision of their political masters. He saw in the Cultural Committee an instrument of a new kind which would enable a government which understood its use to gain immediate benefit from the experience of other governments.

Since his own government was planning a reform of higher education in the Netherlands, why not ask its Brussels Treaty partners to provide it with information on how thinking upon this matter was going on in their own countries? The other delegations were willing to do so.

In the absence of information from Luxembourg, which had no universities, and Belgium, whose delegation found that it had nothing of significance to report, the Netherlands delegation tabled a paper which declared that "a comparative study of higher education in the United Kingdom, France and the Netherlands reveals the existence of parallel trends both as regards existing problems and general tendencies, though the emphasis is sometimes differently placed".

In October 1951 the Cultural Committee "decided to forward this document to the authorities dealing with higher education in each country, asking for their comments". Returning to the subject in April 1952, the committee "thought that, when the question of the reorganisation of higher education came up for consideration in certain countries, it would be helpful to compare the various proposals under study; they thought that the best solution would then be to call a meeting of experts". In September 1952 the Secretary General circulated a memorandum by the Netherlands delegation decribing the draft law on the reorganisation of higher education which had been submitted to the States General three months previously; and at its next meeting (in October) the Cultural Committee agreed to the summoning of a preliminary meeting of experts who would select "a few subjects suitable for immediate and practical examination".

The preliminary meeting drew up an agenda for a larger meeting of experts, and submitted to the Cultural Committee a proposal that a full-scale conference of Rectors and Vice-Chancellors should be envisaged. With the approval of the Cultural Committee, the "Plenary Session on the Reorganisation of University Education" (as it was described in the report) was held, like the preliminary meeting, at The

Hague and under the chairmanship of Dr Reinink. The Netherlands, Belgium, France and the United Kingdom were represented by substantial delegations which included heads of universities or professors as well as civil servants. Luxembourg was represented by its delegate to the Cultural Committee, and there were observers from the Federal German Republic, Italy and Sweden. The team from the secretariat was headed by the Secretary General. The discussions lasted ten days.

A few weeks later, in November 1953, the Cultural Committee met and decided that the resolutions adopted by the so-called Plenary Session should be submitted, without delay, for consideration by the university authorities of their countries. It also approved the convening of a conference of Rectors and Vice-Chancellors, which would be held in the summer of 1955 in the United Kingdom, probably at Cambridge. Preparations for this conference were to be made by an Organising Committee, composed (like the Plenary Session) partly of university representatives and partly of government officials. The Organising Committee was to meet at Clermont-Ferrand in September 1954.

Under the experienced chairmanship of Dr Reinink, the Organising Committee made detailed plans for the Cambridge Conference. The Brussels Treaty countries were represented by a total of twenty-five delegates, rather more than half of whom were drawn from the universities. Denmark, the Federal German Republic, Italy, Norway, the Saar, Sweden and Turkey sent observers. Representatives of student organisations came form France, the Netherlands and the United Kingdom. Once again the Secretary General led the secretariat team in person.

Two months later, in November 1954, the Cultural Committee held its fifteenth session — its last before the expansion into Western European Union. It took note of the report of the Organising Committee and welcomed its decisions. It also noted that the Cambridge Conference, though planned within the context of the Brussels Treaty Organisation, would be held under the auspices of Western European Union; and that the Permanent Commission had therefore decided in principle in favour of including all the Rectors of the Federal German Republic and of Italy.

In concluding its discussion of higher education,

> the committee agreed that co-operation on university matters had so far achieved good results and should be continued within the extended Brussels Treaty. The services of the Brussels Treaty Organisation should be put at the disposal of the Cambridge Rectors if they wished to continue their work within that framework.
>
> The committee recalled that the Council of Europe had, in 1951, considered a conference of European Rectors, but that it had not been put into effect. The committee recognised that the Brussels Treaty University Conferences were a good example of

co-operation which might be carried on, so to speak, in "concentric circles", i.e. the Five (later Seven) Brussels Treaty countries forming the active nucleus of the study with which, in the future, other countries Members of the Council of Europe would associate themselves. This might also be a good solution for the study of questions other than university matters.

Notes to Chapter VIII

1. Preface by the Secretary General of the Brussels Treaty Organisation to **The Civilisation of Europe and the School** by Professor Pierre Joulia. Published in English, French and Dutch in 1954 for the Brussels Treaty Organisation.

2. **Educational and Cultural Films: Experiments in European Co-production,** by S. I. van Nooten, C. H. Dand and J. A. Harrison. Published by the Council of Europe in 1965 in the series "Education in Europe".

3. **En route: International Guide for Young People.** Published in 1951 for the Brussels Treaty Organisation in French, English and Dutch.

4. **Oeuvres de jeunesse dans les pays signataires du Traité de Bruxelles.** Published in French and Dutch in 1952 for the Brussels Treaty Organisation.

Quotations not separately acknowledged are taken from Haigh: **WEU.**

IX.

THE SEVEN OF WESTERN EUROPEAN UNION

1. The conclusion of an amended Brussels Treaty, whereby Italy and the Federal German Republic joined with the five partners of the original *Pacte à cinq* to form a seven-power Western European Union, was a political development, part of the process whereby Western Europe gradually adjusted itself to the post-war world. We are only concerned here with the impact upon the Cultural Committee of the addition to it of a German and an Italian delegation.

The "Protocol Modifying and Completing the Brussels Treaty" was signed in Paris on 23 October 1954, but its ratification was not completed for several months. During this time preparations were being made by the Cultural Committee and by its sub-committees to think of their programme in terms of seven participating countries.

Six and a half years of working together had taught the delegates of the original five countries how to achieve successful collective cultural co-operation in spite of the divergences of administrative systems in each country. They had learned that certain countries could easily find the money, the people and the facilities for co-operative efforts of one kind, but seemed to be partly or even totally inhibited from other forms of co-operation. Cultural co-operation among the five had evolved as a product of these variations of facility and inhibition which, as the committee had come to learn, resulted much less from differences of political theory than from differences in administrative channels.

So, at the fifteenth session of the Cultural Committee, held in the autumn of 1954, "the United Kingdom delegation, making it plain that it was speaking impromptu and without commitment at this stage, enquired whether the other delegations would be interested to receive an invitation to attend a course in London, immediately prior to the next session of the Cultural Committee, in which the United Kingdom delegation would try to explain the manner in which the United Kingdom Government administered its cultural relations with other countries. The other delegations expressed interest in this suggestion, and would be glad to receive an invitation to a three-day course to be held in London" in June 1955, immediately before the sixteenth session.

At this session the course was discussed by the Cultural Committee, where "certain observations made by participants regarding the organisation of the British cultural services seemed to indicate that co-operation between the Seven in the field of international cultural organisations could be made more fruitful. It was pointed out in particular that there existed a certain dichotomy which affected the departments responsible for co-ordinating British cultural participation in the international organisations, on the one hand, in Unesco, and on the other, in the Council of Europe and Western European Union. This situation resulted in the delegations at the meetings of the various organisations being composed of different members."

This weakness was later discovered as being inherent in the administration by the great majority of governments of what was to become known as their cultural diplomacy. If governments have reason to complain that particular aspects of collective cultural co-operation are being discussed simultaneously in different international organisations, the reasons are multiple. To a limited extent, it may be true that some international organisations have an inclination to emulate the more successful activities of others. More important is the fact that there is a partial, and only a partial, overlapping of membership between one organisation and another; and where a particular form of joint activity has proved interesting and valuable to the members of one organisation, governments which are not members of that particular organisation may wish to initiate a similar activity in another organisation of which they *are* members, and may be successful in inducing their fellow-members to act similarly and simultaneously in more than one organisation. But more fundamental is the weakness in national administrations on which the Cultural Committee of Western European Union placed its finger as a result of this course held in London in June 1955. Now that different aspects of educational and cultural co-operation among partially overlapping groups of governments are being carried out in a number of international organisations, the avoidance of duplication can only be achieved — if it is possible to achieve it — where all delegates to all international cultural committees are fully aware of what is being done within their speciality in other organisations of which their government is a member, and what is their government's policy in each instance. Hitherto, most governments have shown themselves lamentably incapable of organising this measure of internal co-operation.

The Cultural Committee was well pleased with the London course, which proved of particular value to the two new delegations. By the autumn of 1957, similar courses had been organised by the French, German and Italian delegations, and held on the eve of the Cultural Committee's meetings in Paris, Bonn and Rome. Then the series ended, for the delegations of the smaller member governments felt that they had nothing to show on a scale comparable with the courses organised by the delegations of the four large countries.

There is no doubt that the four courses gave to those who participated in them an insight into the philosophy and the techniques of cultural diplomacy which was of great value for the future work of the Cultural Committee. But though there was a fair measure of continuity in the membership of the Cultural Committee, there was inevitably also a wastage of old members, as they were transferred to other duties, and a corresponding influx of new. There were not many individuals who had the good fortune to attend all four courses. And as the talks given at the courses were not published, the good which they did was unfortunately no more than transient — except in so far as individual members of the committee were able to introduce into the administrative practice of their own country ideas learned from their study of how these matters were handled in the others. It will probably never be possible to identify such results; but, since the participants in the courses were responsible civil servants engaged in a new and evolving aspect of international relations, it is reasonable to suppose that a number of the lessons learned in one country were applied in some of the others. That, after all, was one of the purposes underlying the whole practice of collective cultural co-operation.

2. In the summer of 1955 a Conference of University Rectors and Vice-Chancellors, which was an important landmark in the history of relations between the universities of Europe, took place in Cambridge.

It would probably be necessary to go back to the end of the Middle Ages to find another occasion when such a large and brilliant assembly of representatives of universities in Europe had met together. In a setting which could scarcely have been more propitious for the achieving of fruitful results in their work, the representatives of more than a hundred universities, together with some twenty senior officials specialising in matters of higher education, made a remarkable contribution to restoring the full significance and giving a new reality to those universal disciplines which are devoted to the liberation of man and to the development of his spirit.[1]

The conference adopted no less than twenty-six resolutions, which represented a remarkable consensus of European university opinion on the themes of the conference. To a certain extent they embodied advice from university representatives to governments, but to a greater extent they expressed agreement on policies which should be carried out by university authorities themselves.

In its twenty-sixth and final resolution the conference recommended that similar conferences should be convened periodically, and that in the intervening periods an organising committee should prepare future conferences and ensure the permanence of relations between the universities. Western European Union accordingly convened a committee which met four months after the closing of the conference to review its results and make plans for the future. This meeting was described in its report as "The first meeting of the Universities Committee". Though this was never indicated in its title, the European Universities Committee became in effect another sub-committee of the Cultural Committee, which reviewed its proposals and submitted them with its own comments to the Council of Western European Union. The Cultural Committee agreed that a considerable amount of latitude should be allowed to the European Universities Committee, on which university representation outnumbered official representation by two to one, if co-operation between university authorities was to be stimulated and encouraged.

In a matter of less than five years the Cultural Committee, starting from a simple project to furnish information on higher education which could be used by one of its member delegations, had gone through the process of developing a practice of co-operation in the field of higher education; to the planning and organisation of a conference which brought together the representatives of a hundred European universities; and finally to creating a new piece of constitutionally recognised machinery whereby inter-university co-operation could be carried out with intergovernmental assistance, and further large-scale conferences planned.

During 1956, the functions of the European Universities Committee were defined as follows:

i. to ensure in the intervals between full-scale Rectors' and Vice-Chancellors' Conferences, the permanence of relations between European universities, and to promote closer co-operation amongst them;

ii. to prepare the Rectors' and Vice-Chancellors' Conferences and to contribute to the implementation of their resolutions;

iii. to assemble information concerning the organisation of university teaching and research;

iv. to pursue studies of university problems;

v. to publish such documents as the committee may deem necessary;

vi. to establish relations with other international organisations dealing with university questions.

Before the end of 1956 the date, place and themes of a second conference had been agreed. It was to be held in Dijon in the summer of 1959. The two themes then debated were "The university and the shortage of scientists and technologists", and "Studies relating to Europe in the universities".

The Cambridge Conference had, almost as an afterthought, adopted a final resolution which had led to the setting up of the European Universities Committee and the holding of the Dijon Conference.

At Dijon, as the preface to the report[2] of the conference says: "Two plenary sessions were devoted to another subject, the organisation of future conferences and of the European Universities Committee; this subject is not dealt with here". It will be left for consideration in the final section of this chapter.

3. At the time of its expansion by the addition of an Italian and a German delegation, the Non-Commercial Cinema Sub-Committee, which soon shortened its name to the Cinema Sub-Committee, had gone far on the road to planning a successor to *The Open Window*. So far indeed that, to the regret of the Cultural Committee, the participation of the two new members was not found practicable. Thus it came about that the second joint film production, though carried out within Western European Union, remained an achievement of the Brussels Treaty Organisation.

This time a different method was adopted. The title was self-explanatory: *December, Children's Month*. A single director and a single production manager commissioned sections of the film from film companies in the participating countries, each section being shot from the overall script, and directed by the overall director. This method proved easier to handle, and easier to finance, than the totally integrated production *The Open Window*: but the final outcome was a less consistent film. Nevertheless, *December, Children's Month*, which was first shown publicly in 1957, was awarded the Bronze Medal for short films at the Venice *Biennale* in 1958. On Christmas Day 1962 it was transmitted by an American television network and on Christmas Eve 1963 by five stations of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation, five and six years respectively after its first appearance.

Having, by the time of its enlargement to seven members, completed the planning, and gone far in the production, of its first series of teaching films on the subject of physical geography, the Cinema Sub-Committee now began the planning of a second series, in which the two new member countries readily agreed to participate, on the "History of Modern Science". This was intended for pupils of from thirteen to fifteen years, and resulted in a series of seven films, four of which secured an average distribution of about 400 copies each. For the project as a whole each film secured, on average, distribution in five countries.

Mention was made in the preceding chapter of the sub-committee's plans for compiling a trilingual glossary of cinema terminology. The original intention of publishing the trilingual glossary without delay, and following it up as soon as possible by a five-language edition, was frustrated by delays in the process of obtaining the concurrence of each participating country in the text. Meanwhile Unesco was found to be engaged in preparing a larger work in more languages, and co-operation was proposed. Finally a *Film Vocabulary*, with an introduction in French, English, Dutch, Italian and German (in which Unesco's co-operation was duly acknowledged) was published in the five languages by the Netherlands Government on behalf of Western European Union in 1958. Demand was such that it had gone out of print before the end of the year, and in due course a new and slightly revised edition was brought out.

One of the sub-committee's earliest activities had been the exchange of information on cultural and educational films available free of all charges, other than actual costs, for viewing in other countries. This was supplemented by the viewing of the films themselves. As a result, national organisations which produced films for non-theatrical exhibition were able to make a far greater number of films available for viewing at only a very slight additional cost. Their clients – schools, cinema clubs and other such bodies – were now able to draw upon a far wider range of films, many of which had been made in other member countries of Western European Union.

As a follow-up to *December, Children's Month* the sub-committee decided to produce a series of six cultural films on leisure; and a series of seven educational films on "Great Europeans" to follow on the "History of Modern Science" series. Finally, just before the sub-committee left the orbit of Western European Union for that of the Council of Europe, it approved the organising by the United Kingdom delegation of a conference on the distribution of non-commercial films. This conference, held in London in 1961, was thrown open to all member states of the Council of Europe, and was followed up a few years later by a further conference organised under Council of Europe auspices by the Swiss Government at Berne.

4. In the autumn of 1955 the Youth Sub-Committee met in Luxembourg. This was its thirteenth session and the first attended by an Italian and a German delegation. Thereafter the sub-committee continued to meet twice a year. Its twenty-second session, held in the spring of 1960, was its last as a sub-committee of Western European Union. It then held three further meetings in 1960 and 1961 as a sub-committee of the "Partial Agreement" Cultural Committee. In 1962 a new permanent committee of the Council for Cultural Co-operation of the Council of Europe, dealing with out-of-school education: youth, physical education and adult education, held its first meeting. The Youth Sub-Committee of Western European Union had constitutionally ceased to exist: in practice, it had become the driving force within a committee with wider responsibilities and larger membership in another European organisation.

The sub-committee continued with the planning, organisation and subsequent evaluation of its series of courses for experts. With participants from seven countries instead of five, the courses became a little more difficult to handle, and linguistic problems made themselves felt. All the same, enough experience had been accumulated by now to enable these problems to be satisfactorily solved. The number of participants per country was strictly rationed and the total kept as near as possible to thirty-six. The courses tended to last for about a week: by the end of the week the participants had got to know one another quite well, and had gained valuable insights into the handling in other countries of problems with which they were familiar in their own.

During 1959 the sub-committee defined its aims as being to promote at international level the training of young people to prepare them for their individual and collective responsibilities in a democratic society and to increase their understanding of the civilisation which is their common heritage. The main methods employed were meetings and courses for youth leaders and experts, and exchanges of information about schemes tried out in various countries. The principle target of the sub-committee's work was defined as young people between fifteen and twenty-five years of age, whether still students or young persons already in employment. These age limits were not, however, exclusive: the sub-committee retained the right to consider matters concerning younger or older age-groups, provided the main emphasis was on education outside school.

The German and Italian delegations lost no time in making their contributions to the international song book which, as mentioned in the preceding chapter, was nearing completion on a five-nation basis when Western European Union came into being. Advance orders had reached a total of 8 530 when the *International Song Book* appeared in 1959, published for Western European Union by Schott Frères of Brussels. A few further publications remain as a memorial to the activities of the Youth Sub-Committee. The travel guides relating to the original five countries, mentioned in the preceding chapter, were completed in 1957 by an Italian guide entitled *Italian Itineraries* and a German guide entitled *Spaziergang durch Deutschland,* both published in English, French and German. The five-country survey, *Oeuvres de jeunesse dans les pays signataires du Traité de Bruxelles,* which had been published in 1952 in French and Dutch, was followed up by the publication in 1957 of a seven-country survey, in French, English and Dutch, called *Youth in the Western European Countries.* German and Italian versions appeared in 1960.

It will be remembered that one of the features of the Cultural Committee and its sub-committees was their peripatetic existence. The Youth Sub-Committee made a special point of exploiting an opportunity provided by the fact that it met in each of the capitals in turn. The host delegation would whenever possible organise meetings between the members of the sub-committee and the representatives of youth organisations in the country where the meeting was being held. This led on to a study of the activities of international non-governmental youth organisations. The concept of co-operation between the intergovernmental and the non-governmental was not, however, to find its full expression until after the cultural work of Western European Union had been fully absorbed into that of the Council of Europe in 1962.

At its twenty-first session in the autumn of 1959, the sub-committee noted that, on the initiative of the French Government (the French delegation had, incidentally, all along shown itself an enthusiastic promoter of youth activities in both the Brussels Treaty Organisation and Western European Union), a meeting of one senior member of the youth departments of each of the member countries of the Council of Europe was being convened in Paris in the spring of 1960. The object of this meeting was to discover what gaps existed in international youth co-operation, and how these might be filled. The twenty-second session of the Youth Sub-Committee – its last session held within the framework of Western European Union – was timed to follow on immediately after the meeting organised by the French Government, at which the seven delegations were of course represented. By this time it was known that the cultural activities of Western European Union would in future be administered in Strasbourg within the framework of a Partial Agreement. It was not yet known that the cultural work of the two organisations would, within two years, be completely fused. It was, however, in the spring of 1960 that the two successive meetings just mentioned prepared the way for that fusion to be so carried out that continuity could be given within the Council of Europe to the youth activities pioneered by the Youth Sub-Committee of the Brussels Treaty Organisation, and successfully carried forward by that sub-committee within the slightly larger framework of Western European Union.

5. The reader of Thornton Wilder's novel knows all along that none of its leading characters will survive the collapse of the Bridge of San Luis Rey. But of course the characters themselves did not. Even so the Cultural Committee and its dependencies only learned in 1959 that they would be transferred to the Council of Europe in 1960; and it was not until the latter part of 1961 that they discovered the fate in store for them – namely, death in the form in which they now existed, and reincarnation within the new cultural complex of the Council of Europe. The reader has all along been aware of this.

The years between 1955, when Western European Union effectively came into existence, and 1960, which saw the migration to Strasbourg, must be regarded as the high noon of the Cultural Committee. The trial and error period of its Brussels Treaty days was now over; it had discovered what it could do and how it could do it, and with the accession of Italy and the Federal German Republic to its members, it now had a substantial part of non-communist Europe as its field of educational and cultural co-operation. This wider extension gave added scope to the activities of its Youth Sub-Committee and its Cinema Sub-Committee, and, as a result of the Cambridge Conference of 1955, it now found itself the parent and supervisor of a Universities Committee, in addition to which it was able to give greater significance to the activities which it directed itself.

Moreover, there was now a parliamentary body which was able and anxious to take a direct interest in its activities. It is true that the Consultative Assembly of the Council of Europe had already been receiving annual reports from the Brussels Treaty Organisation which brought the Cultural Committee's achievements to the notice of an international parliamentary body; but then only some of the members of the Consultative Assembly were representatives of the five Brussels Treaty countries, and the interest of the Assembly as a whole was not so much in what the Cultural Committee had been able to do, but rather in the possibility of its activities being extended to, or taken over by, the Council of Europe. The Paris Protocol of October 1954 added to the Brussels Treaty a new Article 9, which reads in part: "The Council of Western European Union shall make an annual report on its activities . . . to an Assembly composed of representatives of the Brussels Treaty Powers to the Consultative Assembly of the Council of Europe". From now on those members of the Consultative Assembly who represented the parliaments of the seven countries of Western European Union formed an assembly of their own. This Assembly of Western European Union took a keen and continuing interest in the activities of the Cultural Committee, and made recommendations about its future work.

Throughout the period of its high noon, the Cultural Committee devoted some part of each of its sessions to the consideration of the activities of other international organisations in spheres in which it was itself active. When the North Atlantic Treaty Organisation began to develop a modest cultural programme of its own, the Cultural Committee of Western European Union was able to influence that programme in the following manner. As a committee of one international organisation, it could not directly affect the action of a committee of another international organisation. But the seven member governments of Western European Union could, and did, as member governments of NATO, work for the adoption within that organisation of a programme which would not overlap the activities of the Cultural Committee of Western European Union. This operation succeeded, by and large, in achieving its object.

From its earliest days the Cultural Committee had been minded to act within the general framework of Unesco's programme. The world-wide organisation recognised that many of its aims could be more effectively achieved within smaller regional groupings; and the Cultural Committee saw itself as one of these. It discovered that a great many of its activities did not in any way duplicate those of Unesco; and where possibilities of duplication were thought to exist, co-operation between the two organisations was successfully achieved.

Fortunately, the international organisation most likely to duplicate the work of the Cultural Committee was also the one where the means of avoiding duplication were most highly developed. For the members of the Cultural Committee also made up a substantial proportion of the membership of the Committee of Cultural Experts of the Council of Europe. Both of these cultural bodies happily recognised that the smaller of them provided a suitable nursery wherein saplings could be raised to the point at which it became practicable as well as desirable to transplant some of them to the larger.

From its early Brussels Treaty days, the Cultural Committee had kept itself informed of the activities of the Mixed Commissions set up under the cultural conventions concluded bilaterally among its member states. In 1948 there were only five such conventions in existence. In 1954, the number had risen to ten. In the autumn of 1958, the Cultural Committee noted that the network of bilateral cultural conventions among the seven member governments was very nearly complete. Thereafter the item "Mixed Commissions" was tacitly dropped from the committee's agenda.

By the time that the Cultural Committee was enlarged to include Italy and the Federal German Republic, the teachers' courses and the inspectors' courses, which had been a regular feature of its programme from the earliest days, had ceased to be simply an experiment in bringing together persons with similar specialities within a group of countries. They had now become an instrument for [illegible] collectively the study of educational problems common to all, or most of, the participating countries. Sometimes the host government was able to display to its partners what it regarded as a special expertise of its own, and obtain their comments; sometimes the courses simply provided an opportunity for the comparison of different techniques for dealing with a similar problem.

A theme to which the Cultural Committee devoted considerable attention in its final years was educational documentation and information. A course on this subject was organised in France in May 1958 and followed up by a working party, held at The Hague in December of that year, at which the directors of educational documentation services worked out preliminary plans for co-operation. A second meeting of the working party was held in Bonn in October 1959. The working party asked that a course should be organised in 1960 on: "educational documentation as a fundamental contribution to the harmonisation of educational systems in the Western European Union countries." The Cultural Committee had some hesitation about this, and asked the members of the working party first to satisfy themselves that there would be no duplication between what they were proposing to do and what was already being done within Unesco.

Having succeeded in establishing that its activities did not overlap with those of Unesco, the working party was authorised by the Cultural Committee to continue its exploratory activities after the migration from Western European Union into the Council of Europe. Here the work which had been done on this subject was, before long, to assume considerable importance, as we shall see in due course.

Thus, during its final year as the Cultural Committee of Western European Union and during its further transitional period of eighteen months as a Partial Agreement Cultural Committee within the Council of Europe, the successor to the ad hoc committee of cultural advisers which had been convened in August 1948 on the instructions of the Consultative Council of the Brussels Treaty Organisation was busy planning a continuation and an expansion of that part of its work which had emerged successfully from its early experimental phase within the Brussels Treaty Organisation and subsequent testing within the slightly larger framework of Western European Union. Of the original protagonists of this new form of international co-operation, most had passed on to other duties by the time the transfer took place. But continuity was maintained in the persons of a few of the committee's founder-members. In particular, when the Cultural Committee was finally absorbed, in January 1962, into the newly-created Council for Cultural Co-operation of the Council of Europe, Dr Reinink still led the Netherlands delegation and the leader of the Belgian delegation, the late Julien Kuypers, was to be elected its first President.

Before the reasons for the transfer to the Council of Europe of the cultural work of Western European Union are explained, a development must be mentioned which, though it did not constitutionally take place within the framework of Western European Union, was nevertheless a logical outcome of the work of international cultural co-operation developed within that organisation. During 1959 the late Dr Joseph Cals, then Minister of Education, Arts and Sciences of the Netherlands, invited his fellow Ministers of Education of the other six member states of Western European Union to meet him for the purpose of discussing matters of common interest at The Hague. Reference will be made to this meeting in the concluding section of this chapter, since it played a part in the events therein described. But the importance of Dr Cals' initiative was that, reflecting informally the co-operation in educational matters which had been developed formally first within the Brussels Treaty Organisation and then within Western European Union, it proved to be the first of a continuing series of conferences of European Ministers of Education, and was to have profound significance for the future of educational co-operation within the framework of the Council of Europe.

6. The signature in 1957 of the Treaty of Rome brought into existence the European Economic Community, and was destined to cause a fundamental change in Europe's political and economic alignments. One of the least noticed effects of this Western European upheaval was to be the beginning of the end of the cultural work of Western European Union.

During the course of 1958 M. Pierre Wigny, then Minister for Foreign Affairs of Belgium, set in motion a process designed to rationalise the work of the European organisations, other than those of the Six. Belgium, France, the Federal German Republic, Italy, Luxembourg and the Netherlands were all Members of Western European Union. They were all, moreover, Members of the Council of Europe, and of the Organisation for European Economic Co-operation, which was to be transformed in 1959 into a more-than-European organisation — the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. By creating the European Economic Community, the Six had all jointly undertaken a new and much more intensive venture in international co-operation.

While it might well prove easily within the administrative competence of the three larger countries among the Six to accept the additional burden upon civil service personnel which this new venture would obviously entail, without diminishing their participation in the activities of existing European organisations, the strain upon qualified personnel in the smaller countries might prove to be unduly great. Could not the time and energy of busy officials, whose primary task was to work in their own government departments at home, be to some extent spared if the cultural work of Western European Union was transferred to the Council of Europe? For good measure, why not transfer the social work of Western European Union to the Council of Europe at the same time? The problems were not strictly comparable, nor were the ultimate results quite the same. In any event, the social work of Western European Union does not fall within the compass of this book; but the first stage of the transfer was in fact carried out similarly and simultaneously in both spheres and is therefore mentioned here in a spirit of tidiness.

M. Wigny set about canvassing his ideas among his colleagues in both Western European Union and the Council of Europe. The outcome was that in the spring of 1959 the two Secretaries General began to work out arrangements for the transfer of the cultural and social activities of Western European Union to the Council of Europe. Their recommendations were approved by the Council of Western European Union and the Committee of Ministers of the Council of Europe in the autumn of that year. Some of the members of the Parliamentary Assembly of Western European Union objected to the decision; but they were powerless to prevent it.

The decision of the Committee of Ministers of the Council of Europe was contained in Resolution (59) 23 adopted on 16 November 1959. It made provision for a continuation, within the Council of Europe, of two groups of activities listed in an annexe to the resolution: social activities and cultural activities. These activities were to be continued by the seven Members of Western European Union, "to the extent that their governments may consider necessary . . . within the framework of the Council of Europe, on the basis of a Partial Agreement".

The Partial Agreement technique had been approved by the Committee of Ministers so long ago as 1951. It enabled countries not interested in any group of collective activities to be spared not only the trouble, but also the expense of taking part in those activities. Interested governments could enter into a partial agreement to carry out certain activities among themselves, and jointly meet the entire cost.

In September of 1959 the second Conference of European University Rectors and Vice-Chancellors was held at Dijon. In addition to dealing with the academic themes which had been chosen and prepared in advance, the conference adopted two revolutionary recommendations, submitted by a working party, on the organisation of future conferences and of the European Universities Committee.

The first of these recommendations was that a "Standing Conference of European University Rectors and Vice-Chancellors" should be set up to meet at least once every five years in a university city of a member country of the conference. The Dijon Conference, like its predecessor the Cambridge Conference of 1955, had been planned within the framework of Western European Union — a political organisation. From now on, the Rectors and Vice-Chancellors were to plan their own conferences free of all possibilities of political control or even influence. Thus the next conferences at Göttingen in 1964 and at Geneva in 1969 were purely university affairs, and in no way beholden to any intergovernmental organisation. They were planned by a standing committee of Rectors, who met at intervals without the participation of any government officials.

The second procedural recommendation adopted by the Dijon Conference was that the European Universities Committee should be replaced by a committee of not more than one official per country, and up to two university representatives per country nominated by the university authorities. Regarding the constitutional status of this committee, the conference adopted the following final recommendation:

> If, as is understood, the Council of Europe are considering setting up an official advisory body on university matters, it is very desirable that the committee here proposed should fill this role. The committee, in this case, should have equal status with

the Committee of Cultural Experts of the Council of Europe; and should be recognised by the Committee of Ministers, as is the present European Universities Committee, as the independent expert body to be consulted on all questions concerning the universities of member countries.

In November 1959 the Ministers of Education of the seven countries of Western European Union met, as we have already seen, not within the framework of that organisation but privately, at The Hague. The first resolution adopted by the Ministers dealt with the future of the European Universities Committee, and, broadly speaking, endorsed the recommendations of the Dijon Conference.

In December 1959 the Cultural Committee agreed that the transformation of the European Universities Committee into a Council of Europe committee was both practical and desirable. The Committee of Ministers of the Council of Europe duly gave its authorisation in March 1960, and in June the new committee met at Strasbourg under the chairmanship of the Minister of Education of the Netherlands, Dr Cals, and drew up proposals for its terms of reference and rules of procedure. These were approved by the Committee of Ministers in September, and thus was created the Committee for Higher Education and Research of the Council of Europe, whereby all the member states of this organisation now found themselves participating in the work of what had formerly been the Universities Committee of Western European Union.

Meanwhile the Cultural Committee had been considering the effect upon its work of its impending transfer to Strasbourg. In the light of views expressed by its sub-committees, it put forward certain proposals for the immediate future in the form of a short-term policy, and also adumbrated a long-term policy for its work within the new framework.

When the committee next met at Strasbourg in May 1960, it was still, but for the last time, sitting as the Cultural Committee of Western European Union. It looked at its programme for 1960 and 1961. Four courses were planned for inspectors or for teachers. The Working Party on Educational Documentation had established that its activities did not overlap with those of Unesco. The Youth Sub-Committee was authorised to continue its work until the end of 1961, when thought would be given to whether there was any duplication in that quarter. The Working Party on Physical Education and Sport was to be made a permanent sub-committee, and thrown open to all Members of the Council of Europe.

The present production plans of the Cinema Sub-Committee were to be completed by the Seven. But the Cultural Committee, on the advice of the sub-committee, suggested an extension to all

Members of the Council of Europe of the Cinema Sub-Committee's exchanges of cultural, informational and educational films, and of their exchanges of information on production and distribution and in the field of television. More countries should be given the opportunity of participating in the production of educational films. And the Conference on the Distribution of Non-Commercial Films, to be held in London in February 1961, should be extended to all.

The transfer to Strasbourg directed the attention of the Cultural Committee to an important point of principle. The practice of the Council of Europe was to hold its meetings at Strasbourg (or on occasion, at its Paris office). In Western European Union the Cultural Committee and its sub-committees had led a peripatetic existence meeting at the capitals of the member countries in turn. The importance of the principle of rotation was emphasised; it provided direct contact with experts in the various countries, and enabled participants in courses to study on the spot questions within their competence, and provided an opportunity for officials of the host country to become more conversant with European problems.

The final session of the Cultural Committee of Western European Union ended with a formal act of transfer to the Council of Europe. The members were to meet only three times as a Partial Agreement Cultural Committee, for by the end of 1961 the Committee of Ministers of the Council of Europe, meeting at ministerial level, had approved a series of resolutions whereby the Partial Agreement Cultural Committee was to be absorbed into a newly-created Council for Cultural Co-operation.

Notes to Chapter IX

1. Preface by the Secretary General of Western European Union to the **Report of the Conference of European University Rectors and Vice-Chancellors.** Published by Western European Union in English and French, 1955.

2. Second Conference of European University Rectors and Vice-Chancellors, Dijon 1959. **Report of Proceedings.** Published by Western European Union in English and French, 1960.

Texts are quoted from Haigh: **WEU.**

X.

CULTURAL MISSION OF THE COUNCIL OF EUROPE

1. The first session of the Consultative Assembly of the Council of Europe took place in the late summer of 1949. On 5 May 1949, four months after the Consultative Council of the five Brussels Treaty powers had, as was mentioned early in Chapter VIII, agreed on the creation of a Council of Europe, the Foreign Ministers of ten European governments* had met in London and "decided to set up a Council of Europe consisting of a Committee of Representatives of Governments and of a Consultative Assembly." They accordingly signed a Statute, the first article of which declared that "The aim of the Council of Europe is to achieve a greater unity between its Members for the purpose of safeguarding and realising the ideals and principles which are their common heritage and facilitating their economic and social progress".

Within twenty years the number of member governments of the Council of Europe had increased to eighteen. And in a far shorter time the idea of an Assembly of parliamentarians had caught on. The European Communities have their European Parliament; Western European Union its Assembly; and the North Atlantic Treaty Organisation its parliamentarians. But the session in Strasbourg, during August and September 1949, was the first occasion on which members of parliament, drawn from a number of European countries, were able to meet as a statutorily constituted body and make recommendations formally to the Committee of Ministers of an international organisation.

During the course of its first session the Consultative Assembly, under the Presidency of the late Paul-Henri Spaak, devoted a morning – that of 6 September – to debating "Methods by which the Council of Europe can develop cultural co-operation between its Members". In the process of adopting, with certain amendments, the text of the recommendations prepared by its Committee on Cultural and Scientific Questions, the Assembly divided over one simple expression – "in the interest of European unity". There were those who maintained that cultural co-operation should be an object in itself, and not a means to a political end. The conclusion of the matter was that the political motive triumphed, and the words "in the interest of European unity" remained in the text. It is interesting that this question should have arisen at the first public discussion of the cultural mission of the Council of Europe. For ever since and at all levels there has been this fundamental difference of opinion among those who have participated in the Council's cultural work. At some times, one of these attitudes has been in the ascendant; at other times, the contrary attitude has prevailed. But there can be no doubt that the cultural mission of the Council of Europe was originally seen by the Consultative Assembly as a contribution to the political purpose of promoting a greater unity among the member states.

---

* Belgium, Denmark, France, Ireland, Italy, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, Norway, Sweden, the United Kingdom.

Every year the Consultative Assembly has made recommendations to the Committee of Ministers on one thing or another within the cultural field. A Cultural and Scientific Committee (although its name was twice changed) existed from the Assembly's very first session in 1949 until 1967, when a separate Committee on Science and Technology was created: the former Cultural and Scientific Committee thereupon became simply the "Cultural Committee", though this name was soon enlarged into "Committee on Culture and Education". From May 1954 the committee began to meet regularly in between, as well as during, sessions of the Assembly. Its initiatives have led to the adoption by the Consultative Assembly of many recommendations which, like those introduced at the Assembly's very first session, have had a pronounced effect on the subsequent action of the Committee of Ministers in the cultural field. Another effect of the Assembly's own activities has been to bring aspects of the cultural programme of the Council of Europe to the attention of national parliaments.

The Committee of Ministers decided that it needed expert advice on the Assembly's recommendations. By the time the experts met, in June 1950, the original ten Members of the Council of Europe had been increased to thirteen, of which eleven were represented at this first meeting, under the chairmanship of M. Louis Joxe, Director-General of Cultural Relations at the French Ministry of Foreign Affairs, of what was to become the Committee of Cultural Experts.

The Assembly had submitted to the Committee of Ministers an eight-point programme, on which the experts now gave their advice.

Point one suggested a comparative study of the teaching programmes of the various countries, aimed at identifying the elements in each which might have value for all. The experts agreed, spelt out the items on which an exchange of documentation would be valuable, pointed out the importance of using the experience gained by Unesco and the International Bureau of Education, and undertook to proceed immediately with the exchange of documentation.

Point two proposed the development of the teaching in schools of the principal European languages. Here again the experts agreed, and suggested a number of measures designed to promote this activity.

Point three was directed towards the recognition of one country's university degrees and diplomas in other countries. Once more the experts listed a number of steps which might be taken towards the desired goal.

Point four was concerned with the production of unbiased history and geography books, designed to emphasise the links between the peoples of Europe. The experts thought this an important proposal, drew attention to Unesco's efforts and suggested a follow-up by experts from member states of the Council of Europe.

Point five suggested that there should be university programmes, courses and conferences on European questions and organisations. The experts suggested that information on what already existed should be collected and published by the Secretariat, and that certain additional steps should be taken to promote this idea.

Point six was aimed at the creation of scholarships for study abroad and the reception of foreign students in universities and other institutions of higher education. The experts noted that much was already being done, but suggested further action.

Point seven contained a number of ideas designed to stimulate an interest in European unity through different aspects of adult education. The experts suggested action in this sense by governments, and also by the Secretariat.

Point eight was aimed at collective steps to make better known the artistic and archaeological heritage of Europe. The experts drew attention to the work in this field of the International Council of Museums and of Unesco, and suggested action by governments to supplement these.

Turning from the eight-point programme to three further recommendations of the Assembly referred to them by the Committee of Ministers for advice, the experts expressed the view that it was not yet opportune to convene a meeting of Ministers of Education; that they could not recommend a meeting of Rectors of Universities; and that there would be serious difficulties in creating a European cultural centre.

The Consultative Assembly of the Council of Europe has continued year by year, ever since its first session in the summer of 1949, to press the Committee of Ministers to work out and carry into effect a programme of cultural co-operation. Slowly, very slowly, the Committee of Ministers responded to this pressure, and accepted the cultural mission of the Council of Europe. The process whereby this cultural mission came to be formulated and, from very modest beginnings, carried into effect will be described in the pages which follow. It will then be possible for the reader to note that the ideas contained in the cultural recommendations adopted by the Consultative Assembly at its first session in the summer of 1949 came eventually to form the basis of a large part of the Council of Europe's programme of educational and cultural co-operation.

2. Before the end of 1950, the Committee of Ministers had approved the report of the Committee of Cultural Experts, and had identified the subject of equivalences, point three of the Assembly's eight-point programme, as an item deserving priority. This subject was to prove one of the cultural experts' earliest and most noteworthy achievements. One member of the committee in particular deserves the credit for carrying this idea through to the successful conclusion aimed at by the Ministers. Dr Carl Bodelsen, professor of English at the University of Copenhagen and sole Danish delegate to the committee in the early stages of its existence, showed so much initiative and ability in this matter that he became the permanent Chairman of the Sub-Committee on Equivalences which the Committee of Cultural Experts in due course found it necessary to appoint to draft the three conventions foreseen by the cultural experts at their second session.

The European Convention on the Equivalence of Diplomas Leading to Admission to Universities was opened to signature by the member governments of the Council of Europe in 1953, and came into force, on the deposit of sufficient instruments of ratification, in 1954. The idea underlying it was the simple one that any European boy or girl should have the right of entry into any university in any member state of the Council of Europe provided he or she had obtained the necessary qualification to enter a university in his or her own country. But to draft a convention which would give legal force to this aim *and* be acceptable to all the member governments proved exceedingly difficult. In the circumstances, it is remarkable that Dr Bodelsen found a satisfactory formula in so short a time. Satisfactory, that is, in that the convention submitted to and approved by the Committee of Ministers was such that all member governments could sign it. But this result was only achieved by an attenuation of the convention's significance. For whereas some governments, by signing, accepted an obligation to give effect to the terms of the convention, the signature of other governments obliged them to do no more than urge universities in their country to give effect to the convention in so far as lay in their power.

Having piloted this first convention through the Committee of Cultural Experts to the stage of approval by the Committee of Ministers, Dr Bodelsen was equally successful with his European Convention on the Equivalence of Periods of University Study. This convention had a more limited objective, namely to "recognise a period of study spent by a student of modern languages in a university of another member country of the Council of Europe as equivalent to a similar period spent in his home university provided that the authorities of the first-mentioned university have issued to such a student a certificate attesting that he has completed the said period of study to their satisfaction". Like its predecessor, this convention had to be so worded as to take into account the powers that member governments had or had not in the university field. The final text was approved by the Committee of Ministers and opened to signature by the member governments in 1956.

The same course was successfully steered by Dr Bodelsen in drafting the European Convention on the Academic Recognition of University Qualifications. This convention, approved by the Committee of Ministers and opened to signature by member governments in 1959, was designed to enable the holder of a "degree, diploma or certificate awarded by a university, situated in the territory of a Contracting Party and marking the completion of a period of university study" to pursue further university studies and sit for further examinations in the territory of another Contracting Party, as if he held the similar university qualification of that country.

In 1964 the European Convention on the Equivalence of Diplomas Leading to Admission to Universities was completed by a protocol which extended the benefits of the convention to the holders of diplomas awarded by schools sponsored by a Contracting Party outside its own territory.

The most important of the conventions planned, negotiated and drafted by the Committee of Cultural Experts was the European Cultural Convention, which was signed in December 1954 and entered into force the following year. Since it soon came to be regarded by the Consultative Assembly as being the charter of the Council of Europe's cultural mission, it is worth describing the general principles therein enshrined.

Each signatory government had a responsibility to safeguard and encourage the development of its national contribution to the common cultural heritage of Europe. In other words, the member governments were to pledge themselves to act as trustees for that part of Europe's cultural heritage which happened to be placed within their charge.

Within the educational field, each signatory government assumed a twofold obligation: to encourage the study by its own nationals of the languages, history and civilisation of the other signatories and to facilitate the study of its own language or languages, history and civilisation by the nationals of its partners.

Transposing the idea of the Mixed Commission created by most of the bilateral cultural conventions to a multilateral framework, the European Cultural Convention gave a collective responsibility to the Committee of Cultural Experts, through which the signatory governments pledged themselves to consult within the framework of the Council of Europe with a view to concerted action in promoting cultural activities of European interest.

The convention also empowered the Committee of Ministers to invite "any European state which is not a Member of the Council to accede to the present convention". One of the effects of the convention has therefore been to establish that the political act of becoming a Member of the Council of Europe is not a necessary pre-condition to participation in the cultural work of the Council which has, consequently, since the accession to the convention of the first non-member (Spain, 1957) always been carried out within a collectivity slightly larger than the Council's own membership. Governments acceding to the convention were given the right to send delegations to the Committee of Cultural Experts.

One of the recommendations made by the cultural experts at their first meeting was that co-operation should be established with Unesco. On the instructions of the Committee of Ministers, the Secretary General opened negotiations with Unesco, which resulted in 1952 in the signature of an agreement setting out the principles and the methods of co-operation between the two organisations.

3. Many years were to pass before the Committee of Ministers was put into the position of being able to study, and approve, a statement of the cultural policy of the Council of Europe. Yet the first steps which were to lead to the adoption, in 1965, of this statement of policy were taken by the Consultative Assembly at its very first session in the late summer of 1949, when, in the preamble to its first cultural recommendation, it attempted the awesome task of finding a definition of the principles underlying European civilisation itself.

This attempt was followed up by the Committee of Cultural Experts when, at its second session in February 1951, it delegated to a bureau the task of trying to work out a programme of activities, and

00172

to give thought to what the committee ought to try to achieve. To help in this exercise the committee's Chairman, Mr Richard Seymour of the United Kingdom delegation, prepared a note on "Cultural relations and the Council of Europe".

"La note Seymour", as it came to be known, was the starting point of official, as opposed to political, thinking about the cultural mission of the Council of Europe. Written as it was by the Secretary of the British Council, it embodied the fruits of many years' expertise in the administration of international cultural relations. But it must be remembered that the British Council, like the departments concerned with the administration of the cultural relations of other countries, had acquired its expertise essentially in the field of *bilateral* cultural relations. Multilateral, or collective, cultural relations were now beginning to be developed both in the world-wide Unesco, and in such smaller regional groups as those of the Nordic states and the Brussels Treaty countries; but some time was to elapse before the persons involved in these operations came to have an insight into the possibilities of collective cultural diplomacy.

The Committee of Cultural Experts examined "la note Seymour" at its third session in November 1951, and was greatly impressed by its wide-ranging analysis and imaginative suggestions. Many constructive proposals were made, and the general sense of these was that the committee must get away from the bilateral concept, and discover profitable methods of collective action.

At its fourth session, held in April 1952, the committee had before it a revised version of "la note Seymour" incorporating the suggestions which had been made. It made a number of amendments and decided that the final version should be annexed to its report.

In this annexe, entitled "Cultural activities of the Council of Europe", the following mandate was proposed for the Committee of Cultural Experts:

a. to advise the Committee of Ministers on the cultural recommendations of the Consultative Assembly;

b. to present to the Ministers, on its own initiative, proposals on cultural questions intended to help in realising the aims of the Council of Europe;

c. to watch over the effective execution of the recommendations and agreements adopted by the Ministers.

The memorandum then went on to define what the committee thought should be its relations with Unesco; the Mixed Commissions created by the terms of the bilateral cultural conventions; the Brussels Treaty Organisation; the Nordic Cultural Commission; the North Atlantic Treaty Organisation; and non-governmental organisations engaged in European cultural co-operation.

The final and longest part of the memorandum was devoted to the cultural policy and activities of the Council of Europe. It is in this part of the memorandum that the first mention is made of the desirability of negotiating a collective cultural convention: what came of that suggestion has already been described.

Together with the report of its fourth session and the annexed memorandum, the cultural experts for the first time submitted to the Committee of Ministers a programme of action for the year 1953 costed at 13½ million old French francs (the equivalent of 135 000 new French francs, or slightly less than £ 10 000). Not a very ambitious programme to be carried out by fifteen countries: but a beginning nevertheless.

4. A pattern had now been established of proposals of the Committee on Cultural and Scientific Questions of the Consultative Assembly being adopted by that Assembly in the form of recommendations of the Committee of Ministers; reference of these recommendations by the Committee of Ministers to the Committee of Cultural Experts; proposals by the Committee of Cultural Experts for collective action being submitted for approval to the Committee of Ministers; and finally the adoption of some of these proposals as items of a cultural programme.

Some years were to pass before the Committee of Ministers was to approve an institutional link between the parliamentary committee of the Consultative Assembly, which initiated the proposals, and the official Committee of Cultural Experts, which translated some of these proposals into a programme of action. A first step was however taken in this direction when, in April 1955, a special meeting was held of the Assembly's Committee on Cultural and Scientific Questions at which Dr Reinink, head of the Netherlands delegation, presented, on behalf of the Committee of Cultural Experts, a report on five years' work by that committee. This report is of considerable historical value. It is unfortunately too long to quote at any length: but the following summary of the committee's work is based on Dr Reinink's report and completed in the light of subsequent developments.

"The cultural activities of the Council of Europe" explained Dr Reinink

> arose from the determination of the member countries to make it clear that their common civilisation was a feature of their unity. The task of the Committee of Cultural Experts in the last five years has been to strengthen this unity by cultural means, choosing clearly defined, limited but practical fields.

Dr Reinink devoted a certain amount of attention to the conventions, which have already been described. Then he turned to the cultural programme.

> The European Round Table, held at Rome in October 1953, might well become one of our fundamental achievements if we succeed in preparing a synthesis of its conclusions. The purpose of this conference organised jointly by the Council of Europe and the Italian Government was "to study the spiritual and cultural problem of Europe considered in its historical unity and the means of expressing this unity in contemporary terms".
>
> Six eminent Europeans — M. Alcide De Gasperi, M. Robert Schuman, Professor Arnold Toynbee, M. Eelco van Kleffens, Professor Loefstedt and Professor Kogon – were invited to attend this conference and the Chair was taken by M. Denis de Rougemont, Director of the European Cultural Centre. The diversity of views expressed, the divergences resulting from the different academic and national backgrounds and the high quality of the contributions all helped to make this meeting particularly fruitful... It it now the duty of the Committee of Cultural Experts to ensure that this wealth of ideas receives wider publicity. For this purpose it is organising in the course of this year a study group of some twenty well-known publicists under the chairmanship of M. de Rougemont, who will go more deeply into the questions touched upon at Rome. It will then be the heavy responsibility of a General Rapporteur to draw up a synthesis.

The Rapporteur General chosen for this purpose was Professor Max Beloff of Oxford University, and his study was published by Chatto and Windus, London, in 1957 under the title *Europe and the Europeans*. The purpose of the whole exercise was to use a cultural medium to produce a political effect, by attempting to answer the question: Does the background of European history, literature and thought in fact provide a framework for some form of European political union?

The exercise which led to the publication of *Europe and the Europeans* may be likened to the transposition to a large canvas of an idea already executed in miniature by the Cultural Committee of the Brussels Treaty Organisation when, as we saw in Chapter VIII, it produced the "brochure Joulia". Both the large group of teachers, whose thoughts were summarised in the Brussels Treaty Organisation's publication *The Civilisation of Western Europe and the School*, and the small group of eminent statesmen and thinkers, whose discussions provided the raw material for Professor Beloff's book, seem to have found in the word "humanism" the most succinct expression of what Europe has contributed to European and indeed to world civilisation. It was clearly therefore not without good cause that when the Committee of Cultural Experts proposed the launching of a series of European art exhibitions, and was authorised by the Committee of Ministers to proceed with this proposal, it should have inaugurated the series with one (mentioned in Dr Reinink's report) entitled "Humanist Europe".

The plan of these exhibitions was elaborated by the Committee of Cultural Experts from the germ of an idea contained in the Consultative Assembly's eight-point programme. Between 1954 and 1972, fourteen Council of Europe art exhibitions were mounted in eleven European countries. These exhibitions, organised by member governments in turn with highly-developed co-operation from other member governments and the Secretariat, and substantial financial contributions from the Council of Europe, have been a recognised feature of European cultural life. The series constitutes a substantial contribution to the history of European art, and its catalogues have been found by curators of art galleries to contain a great deal of serious scholarship. Like the exercise leading to the publication of *Europe and the Europeans*, the series of Council of Europe exhibitions makes use of a cultural medium in the service of a political aim. The purpose of the exhibitions has been to show the extent to which a unity of artistic inspiration has permeated the diversity of aesthetic expression of European artists: in other words, to point the moral of Europe's intrinsic unity.

5. The issue of a cultural identity card, which (as we have already seen) was taken over by the Committee of Cultural Experts from the Brussels Treaty Cultural Committee in 1954, has proved to be a continuing activity, from which something like 5 000 persons benefit every year. Other early items of the Committee of Cultural Experts' programme have undergone modification, or have completely lapsed. Among these must be counted the research fellowships, which were mentioned in Dr Reinink's report. The purpose of these was to encourage suitably qualified persons to write studies on themes bearing on European integration chosen by themselves. At a later stage, when the cultural programme had undergone a considerable evolution, these research fellowships were replaced by grants for commissioned research on themes which fitted into the cultural programme; the granting of fellowships to persons to enable them to study European themes of their own choice was discontinued. Many of the studies resulting from the original scheme of research fellowships have never seen the light of day; but more than thirty were published by Sijthoff of Leyden in a series entitled "European Aspects".

The annual course of European studies organised by the Secretariat at Strasbourg from 1951 onwards, and described in Dr Reinink's report, was essentially an exercise in publicity. The inspiration for it was drawn from point five of the Assembly's eight-point programme. The participants, composed each year of a different category of people drawn from all the member states, were informed of the activities of the Council of Europe, given an opportunity of listening to a debate of the Consultative Assembly, and heard lectures also about other European organisations. This annual course remained in the programme of the Committee of Cultural Experts throughout the 1950s, and was not discontinued until the early 1960s, when the committee had been superseded by the Council for Cultural Co-operation and its programme had undergone, not only a considerable expansion, but also a distinct change of emphasis.

Dr Reinink told the Assembly's Committee on Cultural and Scientific Questions that "another problem to which the Committee of Cultural Experts attaches the very first importance is the problem of education". The examples which he gave show that it was those aspects of education which have, or might have, a bearing on European integration, which were the committee's particular concern.

Education in civics was one of the themes tackled by the committee. This was described in its programme as a series of courses on "the presentation of the European Idea". That held at the College of Europe in Bruges in 1952 was addressed to secondary school inspectors, and dealt with the presentation of the European Idea to secondary school pupils. The course organised at Nancy in the following year had as its theme the presentation of the European Idea in primary schools and in teachers' training colleges. In 1955 the government of the Saar, which was then an independent Member of the Council of Europe, organised a course at Saarbrucken on "the University and the European Idea". In 1956 the United Kingdom Government devoted a course at Twickenham to "The European Idea in action: past and present". Courses in this series continued to be held for some years, though the choice of themes seems to have caused increasing difficulty to the Committee of Cultural Experts. Then in 1961 the Italian Government organised a course on "Civic education and the training of European citizens" at Frascati. With this course the whole programme took on a new shape: the nature of this new development will be recounted in the next chapter.

The series of courses for historians, which the Committee of Cultural Experts, giving its own interpretation to point four of the Assembly's eight-point programme, inaugurated in 1953 with a meeting at Calw in the Black Forest, had the admirable aim of eliminating biased nationalistic teaching from history text books. This was to prove a continuing activity, whose culmination was not reached until after the Council for Cultural Co-operation had come into being in 1962. Here again the outcome will be examined in its rightful place.

In the spring of 1954 the Committee of Cultural Experts worked out a long cultural programme in response to a request of the Committee of Ministers, which had decided to elaborate, for consideration by the member governments, a Programme of Work which might be carried out collectively by the Council of Europe in all the fields in which it operated. This programme was, and remained, essentially a theoretical exercise: but a very small number of the new items did, in fact, come to be included, within the next few years, in the committee's activities. The first of these was a series of translations into English or French of literary works written in the less widely used languages of the member states, a project which resulted in seventeen publications. A second was the publication of a series of four volumes on different aspects of European folklore. A third was the institution of a film prize (for which the committee had recourse to the expertise of the Cinema Sub-Committee of Western European Union); a fourth the subsidisation of visits of university lecturers between distant member states.

More interesting than these odd items, however, were three tendencies noticeable in the theoretical programme-exercise. One was to consider what aspects of Unesco's world-wide programme might, in co-operation with Unesco, be carried out in greater depth within the membership of the Council of Europe. A by-product of this tendency was the participation of the Council of Europe as a collectivity in promoting Unesco's major project for the mutual appreciation of Eastern and Western cultural values. A second tendency was to regard the cultural experiments of the Brussels Treaty Organisation (shortly to be expanded into Western European Union) as likely to produce results, some of which could profitably be expanded into the wider framework of the Council of Europe. The third tendency was the dawning perception by the Committee of Cultural Experts that educational co-operation was, in the long run, to prove the most important part of the Council of Europe's cultural mission.

6. It must be admitted that the Committee of Cultural Experts, during the first eight years of its existence, was doing an amateur job. There was nothing professional about the small programme of activities which resulted annually from the proddings of the Assembly, the deliberations of the cultural experts and the decisions of the Committee of Ministers. The cultural experts were not to blame for this: it was the system which was at fault.

In 1955 the Consultative Assembly adopted a recommendation on the establishment of a Cultural Fund of the Council of Europe. This recommendation reflected the Assembly's impatience at the slow development of the cultural programme. The recommendation itself was imaginative but, in the form in which it was adopted, very far from practical.

When, therefore, the cultural experts were asked to advise the Committee of Ministers on the recommendation, they took their time over the formulation of their advice. They rapidly discovered that the Assembly's proposals stood no chance of unanimous acceptance by the Committee of Ministers without drastic revision. So they set about the lengthy task of working out proposals of their own. Their aim was: to meet the wishes of the Assembly in so far as this was practicable; to introduce new procedures which would, if not eliminate, at least greatly reduce the handicaps of the amateurish system within which they had hitherto been compelled to work; and at the same time not to make proposals which could not be unanimously accepted by the Committee of Ministers. This work was begun in earnest in May 1956. In June 1958 the Committee of Cultural Experts learned that its advice had been accepted by the Committee of Ministers, and that the Cultural Fund of the Council of Europe would come into existence on 1 January 1959.

In adopting the Statue of the Cultural Fund, the Committee of Ministers expressly delegated some of its powers to an Administrative Board, composed of "a representative of each Member of the Council of Europe who is at the same time a member of its delegation to the Committee of Cultural Experts". Each non-member state which had acceded to the European Cultural Convention was also to be represented on the Board, which was likewise authorised, with the unanimous consent of the Committee of Ministers, to co-opt not more than five additional members. The powers delegated to the Administrative Board were to be those of drawing up an annual cultural programme, and of financing that programme out of the resources of the Fund.

These were to come in the first place from a fixed contribution payable by each member government and by the government of any non-member state which had acceded to the European Cultural Convention; in the second place from voluntary contributions from governments; and in the third place from other, non-governmental, sources. The fixed governmental contributions were to be guaranteed for a period of three years.

The creation of the Administrative Board of the Cultural Fund did not in any way diminish the standing of the Committee of Cultural Experts, which retained the authority vested in it by the European Cultural Convention and also remained the body responsible for giving advice to the Committee of Ministers on cultural matters, including any recommendations emanating from the Consultative Assembly. The Administrative Board was concerned with carrying out a programme of multilateral cultural co-operation in the framework of the European Cultural Convention. In addition to taking the final decisions on the programme recommended by the cultural experts, the Administrative Board was able to concentrate on forward planning, and give thought to cultural policy.

The Administrative Board immediately decided, subject to the approval of the Committee of Ministers which was duly given, to co-opt the Chairman and one Vice-Chairman of the Consultative Assembly's Cultural Committee, and a representative of the European

Cultural Foundation, an international non-governmental organisation with headquarters in Amsterdam. Thus for the first time two members of the Assembly were brought into a decision-making organ of the Council of Europe; thus also were the foundations laid of a partnership, later to be formalised, between the Cultural Fund and a non-governmental organisation.

When the Committee of Ministers approved the Statute of the Cultural Fund, it decided to give to the Fund and to its Administrative Board a three-year term of existence. Before the three years were up it would take a close look at how this new instrument for the planning, approval, financing and execution of the cultural programme of the Council of Europe had worked out in practice.

It was during this three-year period that the new French franc replaced the old, and the Cultural Fund's guaranteed income of fixed contributions from the member governments, which had been expressed as 40 million old French francs, became 400 000 new French francs instead. This guaranteed income was supplemented by a regular annual contribution from the Spanish Government, which had acceded to the European Cultural Convention in 1957; by voluntary contributions from a number of the member governments; by a few gifts from private subscribers; by royalties and bank interest; and by the carry-forward of unexpended balances. Thus the Administrative Board was able to plan a steady expansion of the cultural programme: its budget was balanced at 459 000 francs for 1959, 689 000 francs for 1960 and 806 000 francs for 1961.

During the first year of its existence the Administrative Board recognised that the items of the programme proposed by the Committee of Cultural Experts had been more readily accepted by the Committee of Ministers when they had a political purpose. Promoting the European idea seemed to be the criterion. In the process of working towards a cultural policy of its own, the Administrative Board thought it desirable to introduce a change of emphasis. It was concerned to promote cultural projects of a multilateral kind on the basis of their cultural value. It felt that it should not plan its projects primarily with a view to their effect on European unity, but should rather consider this effect as being a desirable by-product of a programme designed to promote co-operation between member governments in the fields of education and of youth organisations.

Into its programme, therefore, for 1960 the Administrative Board introduced three major projects which, for the time being, had no more than a notional existence. The idea was to work towards the implementation of these projects as and when circumstances and the financial position should permit. The three major projects were: universities, youth, and education (below university level). As we shall shortly see, the Administrative Board had correctly read the signs of the times, and thereby contributed to the new pattern of educational co-operation which was to receive the formal approval of the Committee of Ministers in 1961.

Meanwhile, in accordance with the terms of the Statute of the Cultural Fund, the Administrative Board sought to identify projects which non-governmental bodies would like to carry out if funds were available; to choose from these projects such as seemed best designed to complement the intergovernmental programme worked out by the Committee of Cultural Experts; and to finance or to make contributions to the financing of these projects from the Cultural Fund. From small beginnings the sums devoted to this purpose had grown to 244 000 francs during the year 1962, when the newly-created Council for Cultural Co-operation took over this activity from the Administrative Board. The total was to grow yet further before the Council for Cultural Co-operation found it necessary to discontinue these grants, in order to concentrate its resources upon its own expanding intergovernmental programme.

Among the non-governmental bodies which the Administrative Board elected to support, particular attention was given to "European Schools Day", whose most important activity was the holding of annual essay competitions (on themes relating to the unification of Europe) among some million and a half schoolchildren in about a dozen European countries. The original sponsors of European Schools Day had supported the venture financially for a limited term of years which came to an end in 1960. Shortly before that the Committee of Ministers had accorded its official patronage to the organisation. The Administrative Board decided to supplement this mark of official recognition by the financial support which was now needed. When the Council for Cultural Co-operation later found it necessary to discontinue the awarding of grants to non-governmental bodies, an exception was made for European Schools Day which has continued its spectacular activities in partnership with the Council of Europe.

7. The three years from the beginning of 1959 to the end of 1961 saw the Committee of Cultural Experts working in conditions far more favourable than those that had obtained heretofore. It was now able to plan its programme of cultural co-operation with the firm knowledge that there would be available an annual sum of 400 000 francs which could not be reduced; that additional sums could be hoped for, and would be reported to it as and when they came in; and that monies once allocated to a project would not lapse if that project took longer to complete than had been anticipated. Moreover the cultural experts were no longer working within the strait-jacket of an annual budget: any underspendings would remain available for re-allocation, and could be carried forward.

Another point of great psychological importance was that the cultural experts were now making their recommendations not to a committee of Foreign Ministers (or their deputies) which had no experience of the administration of international cultural relations and was consequently disposed to take its decisions in the light of political and financial considerations, but to an Administrative Board, the majority of whose members were themselves also members of the Committee of Cultural Experts. In spite of (or perhaps because of) the extensively overlapping membership between the Committee of Cultural Experts and the Administrative Board, a division of responsibilities was very soon arrived at. The Administrative Board was at pains to complement, and not to duplicate, the work of the Committee of Cultural Experts.

The impact of this new system of planning upon the cultural programme itself was not immediately noticeable: but it soon became clear that horizons had widened and that more effective work could now be envisaged. The Committee of Cultural Experts was not, however, left in peace to work out a slow and undisturbed development of its programme. For new responsibilities in the field of educational and cultural co-operation were converging upon the Council of Europe, and it was the cultural experts who were to be called upon to advise how these responsibilities could effectively be assumed.

The breathless events of 1959 were recounted at the end of the preceding chapter. As a result of these, the year 1960 saw the creation, within the Council of Europe, of a Committee for Higher Education and Research whereby the work of the Universities Committee of Western European Union was transferred to Strasbourg and expanded to the full extent of the membership of the larger organisation. The new committee worked in parallel with the Committee of Cultural Experts, reporting directly to the Committee of Ministers; though some of its activities were financially supported by grants allocated by the Administrative Board of the Cultural Fund.

The events of 1959 also resulted in the transfer to Strasbourg in 1960 of the secretariat of the Cultural Committee of Western European Union which, in its new guise as a Partial Agreement Cultural Committee of the Council of Europe, decided to throw open to all Members of the Council the courses and other activities planned in its programme for 1961. The conference of government experts on youth questions, which the French Government (as we saw in the preceding chapter) had undertaken in 1959 to organise, was held in March 1960 and set up a co-ordinating committee, on which the Committee of Cultural Experts was represented, to prepare a programme, in close consultation with a number of youth organisations. Not only were short-term projects submitted to the Administrative Board to be financed out of the Cultural Fund, but ideas were mooted for creating continuing machinery for dealing with co-operation in the field of youth questions.

Early in November 1959 (and only a week before the meeting of the Ministers of Education of the seven Members of Western European Union at The Hague), a conference of senior education officials of the Members of the Council of Europe had been held, at the invitation of the French Government, in Paris. One of the purposes of this conference was to consider whether some of the ideas for educational co-operation tried out within the framework of Western European Union might not be applied within the larger context of the Council of Europe. The conference had drawn up an outline programme of co-operation in the field of secondary, and secondary technical education which clearly required to be translated into action by the Committee of Cultural Experts. The proposals had promptly been endorsed by the meeting of Ministers of Education at The Hague.

During 1960 a committee of senior officials, appointed as a result of the meeting of seven Ministers of Education at The Hague in the preceding year, met twice to prepare the holding of a second Conference of European Ministers of Education, this time of all the governments which had signed or acceded to the European Cultural Convention. These meetings were held at Strasbourg with the assistance of the Council of Europe's cultural secretariat. In December 1960 the Committee of Ministers asked that this second Conference of European Ministers of Education, which was to take place at Hamburg in April 1961, should make suggestions for incorporation in an educational, scientific and cultural programme to be financed, in part at least, out of the Cultural Fund. The Committee of Ministers likewise authorised the Secretary General to place a secretariat at the disposal of the conference.

At the same meeting in December 1960 the Committee of Ministers decided to convene an ad hoc committee which was to meet five months later to advise it on an expanded programme of cultural co-operation and on the machinery required to administer such a programme. It also announced its decision that the resources of the Cultural Fund should be substantially increased as from 1 January 1962. Clearly the whole perspective of educational and cultural co-operation within the framework of the Council of Europe had undergone a revolutionary change in the short period since the Cultural Fund itself had come into existence.

The ad hoc committee found itself composed for the most part of members of the Committee of Cultural Experts, and to a smaller extent of members of the Administrative Board of the Cultural Fund: a few of the participants had long-standing experience of the work of the former Cultural Committee of Western European Union (now the

Partial Agreement Cultural Committee), and one or two had also been involved in the preparations for the second Conference of European Ministers of Education (which was held at Hamburg in the month preceding the meeting of the ad hoc committee) and knew that they were going to be concerned also in the preparations for the third Conference of European Ministers of Education, which was to be held at Rome in the following year.

The advice of the ad hoc committee was accepted by the Committee of Ministers in all its essentials. Accordingly the Committee of Cultural Experts, the Administrative Board of the Cultural Fund and the Partial Agreement Cultural Committee all disappeared, and were replaced at the beginning of 1962 by a new structure headed by a Council for Cultural Co-operation.

Note to Chapter X

Texts are quoted from Haigh: Council of Europe.

XI.

THE COUNCIL FOR CULTURAL CO-OPERATION

1. On 16 December 1961 the Committee of Ministers of the Council of Europe adopted a series of four inter-connected resolutions which brought into existence a European intergovernmental organ wholly devoted to cultural co-operation. The Council for Cultural Co-operation, hereinafter to be described as the CCC, was to replace the Committee of Cultural Experts and the Administrative Board of the Cultural Fund, and to assume all their present responsibilities and rights. It was also to take over the activities hitherto carried out under the responsibility of the Partial Agreement Cultural Committee which had itself been transferred in 1960 from Western European Union.

The CCC was to be composed of a delegation from the government of each member state of the Council of Europe, and of each state acceding to the European Cultural Convention; of three parliamentarians representing the Consultative Assembly, whose appointment was to be the responsibility of the Assembly; and of two representatives to be chosen by the European Cultural Foundation. Three permanent committees were to be set up by the CCC, and were to be responsible respectively for: higher education and research; general and technical education; and out-of-school education (youth, physical education and adult education). In order to enable it to handle matters not clearly within the responsibility of the three permanent committees, the CCC was also authorised "to set up working parties on other cultural questions such as cultural exchanges, fine arts, films and television".

The rights and duties of the CCC and its permanent committees were spelt out in detail by the Committee of Ministers. In particular the CCC was given authority:

a. to draw up, for submission to the Committee of Ministers, proposals concerning the cultural policy of the Council of Europe;

b. to co-ordinate and give effect to the overall cultural programme of the Council of Europe;

c. to allocate the resources of the Cultural Fund.

Within the Secretariat General of the Council of Europe the Committee of Ministers decided to set up a Directorate of Education, Science and Culture (it was in fact to become known as the Directorate of Education and of Cultural and Scientific Affairs).

Thus was created a new piece of intergovernmental machinery designed to enable the member states of the Council of Europe, and other European states which had acceded to, or would in future accede to, the European Cultural Convention, to carry out that collective cultural co-operation which they had hitherto been practising experimentally, with inadequate means, and without any clearly defined policy. The programme which was now to be planned and executed by the CCC and its supporting Directorate of Education and of Cultural and Scientific Affairs was to be based on five directives, which showed a marked shift of emphasis away from the political orientation enunciated by the Consultative Assembly in its first cultural debate in 1949. They indicated an acceptance by the Committee of Ministers of the attitude towards cultural co-operation adopted by the Administrative Board of the Fund and described in the preceding chapter. In particular, the three permanent committees which the CCC was instructed by the Ministers to set up were clearly the framework needed to give effect to the three major projects – universities, youth, and education (below university level) – which the Administrative Board had, though only notionally, introduced into its programme for 1960. Whereas the Committee of Cultural Experts had been an instrument designed to enable the Committée of Ministers to give effect to a political purpose in the cultural field, the CCC was to be, more than anything else, an organ for educational co-operation.

Although the CCC was the only piece of European intergovernmental machinery wholly concerned with cultural co-operation in its widest sense, the Committee of Ministers recognised that this field of activity also fell in different ways within the responsibility of other organisations too. Thus Unesco had a world-wide interest in the matters with which the CCC was to concern itself within the framework of the European Cultural Convention countries; the European Communities had certain educational responsibilities which arose out of the Treaty of Rome; and OECD (the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development, which had succeeded the former OEEC, the Organisation for European Economic Co-operation) was pursuing activities related to the economic aspects of education and the training of scientific personnel. The Committee of Ministers recognised the need for co-ordination with these other organisations by instructing the Secretary General "to take steps with a view to strengthening present relations in the cultural field between the Secretariat of the Council of Europe and those of Unesco and OECD and the European Communities".

To the Cultural Fund the Committee of Ministers guaranteed a minimum fixed contribution from the member governments of the Council of Europe of 1 million new French francs a year. This could, as before, be supplemented by voluntary contributions from governments and by gifts from non-governmental sources. In fact the contribution from the member governments was revised to 1 300 000 francs for 1963, and to 1 500 000 francs for 1964.

The Committee of Ministers now followed the precedent it had set itself when it created the Cultural Fund. The ad hoc committee had been convened as a result of its decision, at that time, to review the workings of the Fund in three years' time. Once again a three-year term was set to the new structures. Before the three years were up, a second ad hoc committee was to be convened in order to review their operation and advise the Committee of Ministers on the next phase of the work.

The second ad hoc committee met in the spring of 1964. In the light of its recommendations, the Committee of Ministers, before the end of the year, decided to introduce certain modifications into the CCC's programme directives, to add to its structure a fourth permanent "Technical Committee for Film Activities", and to fix the guaranteed contributions of the member states to the Cultural Fund at not less than 1 500 000 francs a year for the next three years. The Committee for Out-of-School Activities was given a more clearly-defined mandate. Means whereby the medium of television could be harnessed to the purposes of the CCC were to be studied by the Secretary General. The cultural programme was to be adapted progressively to the methods of co-operation introduced in the educational fields and was to concentrate principally upon the problems of preserving and developing the cultural heritage in the new conditions of industrial society. The staff of the Directorate of Education and of Cultural and Scientific Affairs was to be progressively expanded in order to enable a larger, though more concentrated programme to be carried out.

2. The inheritance of the CCC was drawn from two rather different concepts of collective cultural co-operation. One of these, derived from Western European Union, had been developed pragmatically by officials, working on the principle of trial and error, in order to give effect to an article of a treaty. This had resulted in the evolution of certain techniques of intergovernmental co-operation, particularly in the sphere of education, which the CCC lost no time in adopting.

The other concept of collective cultural co-operation inherited by the CCC had grown up within the Council of Europe itself. Apart from the financial and structural features which differentiated the cultural work of the Council of Europe from that of the Brussels Treaty Organisation/Western European Union, there was a notable difference of approach. The Committee of Cultural Experts of the Council of Europe showed the same pragmatic tendencies as the Cultural Committee of the smaller organisation (not unnaturally, since the latter was comprised within the former). But whereas the smaller

Cultural Committee had been convened to give effect to a clause of a treaty, the cultural experts of the member states of the Council of Europe were first brought together in order to advise the Committee of Ministers on a number of cultural recommendations made by the Consultative Assembly. The European parliamentarians of whom the Consultative Assembly was composed had not the pragmatic approach to cultural co-operation which is a natural characteristic of the civil servant; their concern was primarily with the philosophy of the Council of Europe's cultural mission.

Thus it came about that the Committee of Cultural Experts and the Administrative Board of the Cultural Fund had a consciousness, which does not seem to have been shared by the Cultural Committee of the Brussels Treaty Organisation/Western European Union, of carrying out their task of collective cultural co-operation within the framework of a cultural policy which would surely one day have to be clearly and explicitly defined. When creating the CCC, the Committee of Ministers, as we have just seen, gave it authority "to draw up, for submission to the Committee of Ministers, proposals concerning the cultural policy of the Council of Europe". In April 1965 the Committee of Ministers approved, without modification, a document entitled "The cultural policy of the Council of Europe". This document, of which the first draft had been prepared on the instruction of the CCC by the Directorate of Education and of Cultural and Scientific Affairs, was the fruit of prolonged discussion and revision by that body over a period of eighteen months.

In formulating the cultural policy of the Council of Europe, the CCC had to find simultaneous and satisfactory answers to three questions: "What does the Consultative Assembly consider to be the cultural mission of the Council of Europe?", "What does the experience of our predecessors and ourselves show to be a practical method of giving effect to this mission?" and "What formulation, designed to fulfil these two requirements, will meet with the approval of the Committee of Ministers?"

"The cultural policy of the Council of Europe" is too long to be set out here, but its first three paragraphs, and its conclusion, deserve to be quoted:

> The Members of the Council of Europe and the states which have acceded to the European Cultural Convention all enjoy a civilisation composed of similar basic ingredients, made up in varying proportions. Geographical features and the course of history, in particular the emergence of the "nation-state", have resulted in European civilisation becoming differentiated into a number of variegated national compounds of these basic ingredients.

At a time when humanity as a whole is undergoing one of the most profound demographic, technical and cultural transformations in history, the demands of an industrial civilisation and the situation of Europe in relation to the rest of the world impose on each of our governments and peoples tasks which cannot be accomplished without mutual co-operation, if Europe is to remain among the foremost creators of human, family and social values.

The aim of the Council of Europe as stated in Article 1 of its Statute is "to achieve a greater unity between its Members for the purpose of safeguarding and realising the ideals and principles which are their common heritage and facilitating their economic and social progress". It must, however, be recognised that European civilisation owes its richness to its diversity. The cultural policy of the Council of Europe must therefore be designed not only to emphasise the common heritage of its Members but also to win the appreciation of all for the individual contribution of each.

. . .

The Council (for Cultural Co-operation) should achieve a twofold result. It should help member states and states signatory to the Cultural Convention to meet their educational and cultural needs more rapidly and more efficiently, and it should give to the people of their countries a more vivid picture of the interdependence of individual countries in the context of European civilisation.

It was from "The Cultural policy of the Council of Europe", then in draft form, that the ad hoc committee of 1964 derived the nine programme directives which were subsequently adopted by the Committee of Ministers in substitution for the five programme directives originally given to the CCC at its creation. The new directives took the following form:

a. To bring new ideas, new techniques, new achievements discovered in one member country to the attention of all and facilitate their adaptation to the needs of other interested members;

b. To pool national achievements and make the people aware of their common responsibilities as Europeans;

c. To increase the educational potential of each country;

d. To promote the study of the particular questions brought to its notice by the resolutions of the Conferences of European Ministers of Education, which have adopted the principle of identifying particular subjects requiring collective study;

e. To multiply instruments of practical co-operation between European educationists;

f. By close organic co-operation, to help governments to enable Europeans to enjoy the training and environment needful for the constant renewal of the creative genius, particularly by preparing them for active participation in "a civilisation of leisure";

g. To facilitate exchanges of persons and cultural material between different countries;

h. To develop mutual aid between member countries;

i. To make known to both Europeans and non-Europeans the ideas, conceptions and creative works of the European genius, and to prepare Europeans for their responsibilities with regard to their cultural heritage.

3. A study of the origins and growth of the Documentation Centre for Education in Europe provides an interesting case-history within the wider context of European educational co-operation. Meetings of specialists in educational documentation had already started in the days of the Cultural Committee of Western European Union, as we saw in Chapter IX. It was these specialists who inspired the resolution in which the Conference of European Ministers of Education, meeting at Rome in October 1962, asked the Council of Europe to set up a documentation centre. Before the year was out, the Committee of Ministers of the Council of Europe had approved this proposal in principle. A beginning was made by the Directorate of Education and of Cultural and Scientific Affairs in 1963, the CCC convened an advisory group early in 1964, and in July of that year the Centre was officially created by the Committee of Ministers.

Meanwhile the Ministers of Education had, at their fourth conference held in April 1964, adopted a further resolution requesting the creation of a complementary service of educational research. This time their request was more complicated and less clearly formulated: the Committee of Ministers chose to defer a decision until it could be presented with clear-cut proposals. The Directorate of Education and of Cultural and Scientific Affairs had first to obtain clarification by correspondence with the Ministries of Education; then the CCC once again convened an advisory group to define exactly what the Ministers of Education required. Thereupon the Committee of Ministers gave a favourable decision and an Educational Documentation and Research Division, which absorbed the Documentation Centre for Education in Europe, was created within the Directorate of Education in 1967, and became fully operational in 1968.

In the field of educational documentation, the Division is concerned to build up a basic library on educational, cultural and scientific developments, in order to be able to meet requests for information; to promote the flow of educational information by issuing periodical documentary publications; and to improve co-ordination and co-operation within the system of educational documentation in the member states.

The Ministries of Education of the member governments, and such educational bodies as they recommend, receive a two-monthly *Newsletter* on educational developments in the member countries. They are also supplied three times a year with an *Information Bulletin* giving up-to-date information about the activities of the CCC and its committees, together with extracts from important documents or reports on educational policy. In 1966 a series of basic educational bibliographies, of both books and periodicals, was published; a revised and enlarged edition was brought out in the autumn of 1968.

By 1969 the Documentation Centre had published (in both English and French) some two hundred abstracts on educational legislation, major reforms, new experiments. In 1967 a *European Survey on the Educational Documentation and Information System* was carried out, and published in 1968. This pointed out the desirability of setting up a co-operative system of computerised documentation centres on a European scale. The CCC promptly convened a working party on the application of computer techniques to educational documentation and information. Its report, published at the end of 1969, recommended the creation of a computer-based *European Documentation and Information System for Education (EUDISED)* in the geographical region covered by the member states of the CCC.

In June 1970 the EUDISED report was examined by experts from fifteen member states of the CCC and by observers from OECD and from the International Bureau of Education created by Unesco. The meeting endorsed the proposal, but considered that further studies and experiments were needed before any particular system could be recommended to governments. It now remains to be seen whether the member governments of the CCC can agree to set up systems which can be integrated into a EUDISED before several of them have become so deeply committed to different systems that this great opportunity for European co-operation is allowed to slip away.

In the field of research, the Division for Educational Documentation and Research has two separate, but closely-related aims. One is to collate and distribute regular information on educational research projects newly completed or in progress in member states; the other to provide a forum for discussion of common problems with a view to co-ordinating research into such problems. A three-volume *European Survey of Educational Research*, covering eighteen countries, was published and presented to the sixth Conference of European Ministers of Education held in May 1969. A second such survey was published two years later. Since the infrastructure, in particular the institutes and the personnel necessary for carrying out modern educational research, does not yet exist in all member states, plans have been made for the secondment of teachers or graduate university assistants willing and able to specialise in educational research to advanced educational research institutes in other countries with the requisite facilities.

Thus the Division for Educational Documentation and Research, brought into being within the Directorate of Education and of Cultural and Scientific Affairs of the Council of Europe in two stages in response to two resolutions of the Conference of European Ministers of Education, has been tailored to the Ministers' own specifications and is actively engaged in working directly in the interests of their departments.

4. Of the CCC's permanent committees, it was the one with no antecedent history, the Committee for General and Technical Education, which proved the most responsive to the resolutions of the Conference of European Ministers of Education.[1] An instrument was required to give effect to the outline programme of educational co-operation which, as related in the preceding chapter, was drawn up by a meeting of senior education officials held in Paris in November 1959; endorsed by the first Conference of European Ministers of Education held at The Hague later in the same month; and commended to the Committee of Cultural Experts immediately afterwards when the Administrative Board of the Cultural Fund chose "Education" as one of its three major projects for the future.

Two of the programme items initiated by the Committee of Cultural Experts were pursued further by the newly-created Committee for General and Technical Education. One of these was the series of courses on "the presentation of the European Idea" which had culminated, as we saw in the preceding chapter, in 1961 with a course at Frascati on "Civic education and the training of European citizens". The follow-up to this course led to the formation of a European Civics Campaign, in which the Council of Europe co-operated with the European Communities, the European Cultural Foundation (of Amsterdam) and the European Cultural Centre (of Geneva). In 1964 the Committee of Ministers adopted a resolution drawing the attention of governments and of international organisations to present defects in the teaching of civics. The efforts of the Committee for General and Technical Education to suggest remedies for these defects are reflected in two publications in the CCC's series "Education in Europe": *Civics and European Education at the Primary and Secondary Level* (1963) and *Introducing Europe to Senior Pupils* (1966); and in two booklets in the companion series: *Out-of-class Activities and Civic Education* (1967) and *Steps towards a European Civic Education in the First Period of Secondary Education* (1970).

The series of courses on the revision of history textbooks, mentioned in the preceding chapter, had led, in 1961, to the publication, by Sijthoff of Leyden, in eight languages of a booklet entitled *A History of Europe?* The Committee for General and Technical Education now embarked on a series of courses on the revision of geography textbooks, which led, in 1967, to the publication in the series "Education in Europe" of *Geography Teaching and the Revision of Geography Textbooks and Atlases*. This was supplemented by the following booklets in the companion series: *Films on Geography – a Selective Catalogue* (1966); *Films for the Teaching of European Geography* (1969); *The Different Countries of Europe seen by their Geographers* (1970) and *The Teaching of Geography in Primary and Secondary Schools in Europe* (1970). As a follow-up to the history textbooks exercise the committee published, in the series "Education in Europe", *History Teaching and History Textbook Revision* (1967) and *The Place of History in Secondary Education* (1969).

In 1962 the Conference of European Ministers of Education defined its relationship with the Council of Europe, and in 1963 the CCC asked its committees to take the resolutions of the conference into account when formulating their programmes. One of the first-fruits of this co-operation was the first publication in the CCC's series "Education in Europe" entitled *Primary and Secondary Education: Modern Trends and Common Problems* (1963). Other publications in the series reflecting this co-operation are: *Pupil Guidance – Facts and Problems* (1964); *School Systems – A Guide* (1965 – revised edition 1970); *Teacher Training* (1965); *The Observation and Guidance Period* (1967); *Examinations – Educational Aspects* (1968).

The committee's publications have never been more than a by-product, enabling its work to be brought to the attention of teachers and educational administrators. The principal aim of the committee has all along been to enable those responsible for different aspects of educational policy and educational administration in the member countries to become familiar with the problems encountered, and the solutions to these problems found, by their colleagues in other member countries; to study common problems jointly with these colleagues; to exchange ideas with representatives of non-governmental organisations working in the same fields; and thus to increase their ability to find more satisfactory solutions to the problems facing them in their own countries. Thanks in part to its homogeneity – it is composed of senior officials of Ministries of Education – the Committee for General and Technical Education has shown itself to be the most effective organ of intergovernmental co-operation within the CCC's complex.

Unlike the Committee for General and Technical Education, the Committee for Higher Education and Research had enjoyed an earlier incarnation as the Universities Committee of Western European

Union: this, and its migration to Strasbourg, were narrated in Chapter IX. With the reorganisation which took effect at the beginning of 1962, the committee, which had for two years been reporting directly to the Committee of Ministers, suffered an apparent diminution of its status. There now began a process which has been working itself out ever since: the process whereby the committee had to adapt its thinking to the task of a specialist body subordinate to the CCC and responsible for the planning and supervision of that part of the CCC's programme which related to higher education and research.

It is greatly to the credit of the committee that this adaptation was, in the fulness of time, successfully made. There is no other comparable body in existence. A score of European nations are represented on it, both by Rectors or Vice-Chancellors nominated by the university authorities of each country, and of officials nominated by governments. Governmental and university representatives have nearly always found it possible to reach agreement on this committee wherein conflicting national attitudes have to a very large extent become fused in a concept of higher education and research which is essentially European.

The search for equivalence is an essential part of the striving towards European integration: it has proved almost as difficult of achievement as the search for the Holy Grail. The Equivalence Conventions of the Committee of Cultural Experts made a brave and essential first step in this search. But at their second conference, held at Hamburg in 1961, the Ministers of Education gave consideration to the possibility of ensuring "a more active promotion of equivalence of university degrees among member countries of the Council of Europe" and suggested that a new line might be pursued by the Committee for Higher Education and Research in order to work towards this goal.

The committee accordingly decided to try the experiment of examining the disciplines taught in the universities of Europe one at a time. The idea behind this exercise was that by preparing and publishing a series of studies, discipline by discipline, on both similarities and differences in methods of teaching and on the degrees and diplomas sanctioning each discipline, an advance might be made towards achieving improved teaching methods and, consequently, a greater equivalence in the value of degrees. The committee's findings have been published progressively in the series "Education in Europe"; comparative studies have already appeared on the teaching in European universities of chemistry, biology, physics, geography, economics and mathematics.

The committee has also published a number of studies on the staffing, structure and reform of universities in Europe: and others under the general title "European Research Resources" in which particular attention is given to the possibilities of future co-operation in research at a European level. It has also, in response to a resolution adopted by the Ministers of Education at their fourth conference held in London in 1964, drafted a "European Agreement on Continued Payment of Scholarships to Students Studying Abroad" which, after a slow passage through the machinery of the Council of Europe and the member governments, was eventually approved and opened to signature in December 1969.

Other examples of the committee's work will have, in the interests of perspective, to be omitted. They fall within the following terms of reference, worked out by the committee early in its life and approved by the Committee of Ministers:

1. To ensure or encourage co-operation between European nations in the field of higher education and research;

2. To address opinions and recommendations on problems in this field to European governments and intergovernmental organisations;

3. To promote closer relations between universities and European institutions of higher education and research;

4. To prepare any documentation, carry out any studies and publish any material deemed useful.

5. When the Committee of Ministers decided that one of the permanent committees of the CCC should have responsibility for out-of-school education: youth, physical education and adult education, it created a troika drawn by three horses which were not out of the same stable. Physical education had been only a marginal interest of the Youth Sub-Committee of Western European Union: adult education was a new province altogether. In the circumstances, it was natural that the Out-of-School Education Committee should start with a built-in youth programme, and should only have made slow progress towards developing meaningful programmes in its other two fields of responsibility.

The committee directed its efforts towards getting public authorities to adopt measures to ensure the physical and moral well-being of young persons and proper out-of-school training. It also adopted the political aim of trying to find ways and means of associating youth with the building of Europe. It made a practice of bringing representatives of several non-governmental youth organisations to Strasbourg for the purpose of informing them of, and obtaining suggestions on, its programme; and it helped to bring into existence the Council of European National Youth Committees (CENYC). Formed in 1963, CENYC consists of representatives of national youth committees in fourteen of the CCC's member states, and serves as an "opposite number" of non-governmental organisations capable of dealing collectively with youth matters in confrontation with European intergovernmental organisations.

After a variety of experiments, leading to a number of publications, the physical education section of the committee concentrated its efforts on promoting the concept of sport for all. Its booklet *Sport for All – Exercise and Health* was published as a companion volume in 1969. The underlying concept includes not only sport as such, but also physical exercises such as free spontaneous play. The objective is a co-operative campaign to arrest the physical degeneration which is recognised to be damaging health in industrialised societies.

In the field of adult education it was only after much groping that the committee at last found its mission. Primary, secondary and higher education, having each a long history, have tended to develop standardised forms. Adult education is new enough to be in the fluid state, and the committee eventually grasped its opportunity of discovering and promoting constructive ideas while the responsible authorities in the member states are still receptive of guidance. A publication entitled *Workers in Adult Education: their Status, Recruitment and Professional Training* appeared in the series "Education in Europe" in 1966, and was followed up in 1971 by *The Present Situation and Possible Developments in Adult Education in Europe.*

In the field of youth organisation, the Out-of-School Education Committee has been active in a variety of directions, sometimes in co-operation with OECD, sometimes with Unesco, more often on its own. These activities have given rise to a number of informative publications. But its outstanding achievement has been the creation of a European Youth Centre. The committee began in the autumn of 1963 to run a nucleus of such a centre on an experimental basis. For two years the CCC kept an open mind about the value of the experiment. Before the end of 1965 it had become clear that the experiment was meeting a much felt need among non-governmental youth organisations, and was focusing the attention of youth leaders in the Cultural Convention countries on the advantages of co-operation within a European framework. A point of interest had emerged: Strasbourg had come to be regarded, among the youth organisations touched by the work of the Centre, not as a town in one of Europe's many countries, but as a symbol of European unity.

In 1967 the Committee of Ministers accepted the recommendation of the CCC that a permanent youth centre with residential accommodation for forty trainees should be created by the Council of Europe at Strasbourg. The municipality of Strasbourg made available a site near the Council of Europe on very favourable terms, and the Norwegian Government generously offered the services of two architects. The permanent European Youth Centre was opened in 1971.

It is an educational institution, in the administration of which non-governmental organisations and the European Communities participate with the Council of Europe, with the aim of providing the best possible complementary training for youth leaders. It endeavours to propagate knowledge, methods and techniques of general interest in work among young people. One of its purposes is to stimulate the exchange of ideas and experience in a spirit of enquiry: and it is intended to function in such a way as to become in the eyes of non-governmental youth organisations a meeting-place favourable to the development of international understanding and the study in depth of European problems.

The activities of the Cinema Sub-Committee of the Brussels Treaty Organisation and of Western European Union have been described in Chapters VIII and IX. When the CCC came into existence in 1962 it found that it had inherited a number of continuing activities in the field of the cinema with no committee of experts to superintend their execution. It got round this difficulty by authorising a group of film experts to meet twice a year to advise it on matters within the experts' competence. In 1964 the second ad hoc committee recommended that the film experts should be established as a "permanent technical committee for film activities, at the service of the CCC and its subsidiary organs". Thus the old Cinema Sub-Committee, having officially expired with the creation of the CCC was nevertheless – by a subterfuge – given an enlarged, though unofficial, existence during the years 1962, 1963 and 1964. Formally restored to life at the beginning of 1965, it died a formal death, as we shall see in the next chapter, at the end of 1967.

When the Committee of Cultural Experts instituted a Council of Europe film prize, and at a later date a newsreel prize, it obtained the necessary technical assistance from the Cinema Sub-Committee of Western European Union. The films and the newsreels were required to illustrate a European theme, but were also judged on their artistic value. A number of documentary films and newsreels of outstanding merit had thus received recognition when the prizes were awarded, for the last time, at the International Film Festival at Locarno in 1964. From then onwards, on the advice of its film experts, the CCC has organised an annual "Council of Europe Film Week". This Film Week has been held each year in co-operation with the organisers of one or other of Europe's International Film Festivals. The object of this exercise is to encourage the production of short films, both cultural and educational, of the highest quality, and to assist in the wider distribution of those judged to be the best. The Council of Europe Film Week has survived the final demise of the Technical Committee for Film Activities.

The London conference on the distribution of non-commercial films, mentioned in Chapter IX, was followed up in 1966 by a conference in Berne on the theatrical distribution of cultural films. Its report, published in 1967 in the CCC's series of companion volumes, contained recommendations for greatly invigorating European co-operation in the use of cultural films. But with the demise of the Technical Committee for Film Activities at the end of that year its exciting programme of international co-operation in the field of cultural and educational films came to an end, though the production of educational films in support of the CCC's educational programme was in a reduced measure continued.

In addition to the co-productions mentioned in Chapters VIII and IX, the publication *Educational and Cultural Films: Experiments in European Co-production* published in the CCC's series "Education in Europe" in 1965 describes a series of cultural films on the problem of leisure in a modern society and three series of educational films, one on science, a second on Great Europeans, and the third on the teaching of modern languages. A further series, destined to be an aid to the teaching of biology, consisted of twelve films and was called "The Living Cell".

While the activities described in *Educational and Cultural Films* formed the most creative part of the work of the Technical Committee for Film Activities, its basic function was to promote the use in as many as possible of the member countries of the CCC of educational and cultural films produced in any one of them. Monuments to the committee's work are to be found in the following publications of the CCC: among the companion volumes *The Contribution of Audio-Visual Media to Teacher Training* (1965); *Audio-Visual Aids in Developing European Countries* (1966); *European Research in Audio-Visual Aids* (in two parts, 1966); and in the series "Education in Europe" *The Use of 8 mm Films in European Schools* (1967) and *Art of the Cinema in Ten European Countries* (1967). The last-named publication has since been supplemented by the production of a number of national film anthologies illustrating this art in more vivid form than can be achieved by the written word alone.

6. In the context of this book, it is unfortunately inescapable that the word "culture" has to be used in two different senses. Just as the Conference of Ministers of Education of the German *Länder* is described in German as a *Kultusminister Konferenz*, so in the titles "European Cultural Convention", "Committee of Cultural Experts", "Cultural Fund" and "Council for Cultural Co-operation" the word is used in a wide sense which includes the whole range of educational co-operation. Now we must concentrate on those activities, carried out directly by the CCC or through small sub-committees, which are cultural in the narrower sense – a sense which it will be easier for the reader's mind to grasp than for the author to defiine.

A new concept was introduced into the CCC's programme of cultural activities in the policy document mentioned earlier in this chapter. Here it was stated that "in recent years governments have realised the need to equip themselves and utilise their resources to pave the way for a 'civilisation of leisure' which will enable every European to benefit from the common cultural heritage and enjoy the training and environment conducive to a constant renewal of the creative spirit. Closer organic co-operation must consequently make it possible for governments to help one another by pooling their national experience and at the same time make people aware of their common responsibilities as Europeans." The programme of cultural activities now came to be classified under two headings: "Development of the European cultural heritage"; and "Man and his cultural environment".

It seems likely that the series of European art exhibitions, described in the preceding chapter, will for long continue to be regarded as the major achievement of the CCC, and its forerunner the Committee of Cultural Experts, in developing a consciousness among Europeans of their cultural heritage. The cultural identity card also falls naturally under the first classification. So did the CCC's contribution to Unesco's major project on the mutual appreciation of Eastern and Western cultural values. Books, catalogues and slides were made available to Unesco for distribution to libraries and cultural institutes in Asia and Africa; and in 1964 the CCC brought out specially for Unesco a bibliography of selected European works under the title *European Cultural Values: Bibliographical Indications.*

Among other activities which can be regarded as contributing to the development of the European cultural heritage are the publication of studies on *Cultural Tourism and Awareness of Europe, How to Visit a Museum* and *Discovering Architecture*; the production of a film on *Communication Routes in Europe*; work aimed at overcoming some of the problems confronting travelling orchestras, by trying to achieve a standardisation of musical pitch throughout Europe; and the signature in May 1969 of the European Convention on the Protection of the Archaeological Heritage.

Into the classification "Man and his cultural environment" falls a long-drawn-out exercise by the CCC devoted to the preservation and rehabilitation of groups and areas of buildings of historical and artistic interest. In 1963 the Consultative Assembly adopted a recommendation to the Committee of Ministers on this subject: the Committee of Ministers approved the recommendation and asked the CCC to carry out a series of studies designed not only to produce a clear and accurate picture of the existing situation but also, and especially, to seek practical solutions to the problems involved.

As a result the CCC, between 1965 and 1968, organised five so-called symposia, attended by senior officials responsible for ancient monuments and a selection of highly-qualified experts. The symposia were held at Barcelona, Vienna, Bath, The Hague and Avignon. An early result was a pilot project of the CCC centred upon the protective inventory of the island of Malta, as a step towards the preparation of a European standard card index for the preservation and rehabilitation of groups and areas of buildings of historical or artistic interest.

The fifth symposium enabled the new policy worked out at the previous four symposia to be defined still more clearly, and made it possible to delineate the concept of a policy of genuine integration into the overall regional planning and economy of the country wherein historic sites and monuments are essential components. Such was the interest aroused by the first four symposia, that the fifth was attended by observers from the USSR, Poland, Czechoslovakia and Yugoslavia.

These five symposia led to the holding in Brussels, in November 1969, of a European Conference of Ministers Responsible for the Preservation and Rehabilitation of Monuments and Sites. The outcome has been an intensification of European co-operation in a field of activity which governments have come to regard as so important that it has outgrown the scope of a single aspect of the CCC's cultural programme: the Committee of Ministers has created a new committee for this purpose, serviced by a new Directorate of the Council of Europe.

The cultural activities just described have been conducted under the direct responsibility of the CCC by ad hoc groups of experts, not by any of the CCC's permanent committees. The harnessing of audio-visual media to educational and cultural purposes has been handled similarly by the CCC, except in so far as the Technical Committee for Film Activities has acted as the intermediary. The use of audio-visual media as an adjunct to modern language teaching forms part of a combined operation. Otherwise, the CCC has used small groups of experts to help it examine, in particular, the part which television has to play in the context of teaching.

In the early stages, these studies were exploratory; but they soon led to the conclusion that there was a proper field of activity for the CCC in representing consumer interests, whereas it is producer interests which are represented by the European Broadcasting Union. A conference organised by the CCC in Rome in 1966 led to the publication, in the series "Education in Europe", of a book on *Direct Teaching by Television*. The following have appeared among the companion volumes: *International Exchange of Television Programmes for Schools: Legal and Economic Problems*, and *The Use of Closed-Circuit Television in Technical Education*.

Since 1967, the CCC has been giving attention, not only to the uses of television and other audio-visual media at different levels of education and in support of a variety of disciplines, but to the effects of the rapidly-developing technique of the use of satellites in the distribution of television programmes. Hitherto Europeans had concerned themselves with the technical and the commercial aspects of satellites. It was the CCC which drew the attention of European governments to the implications of this new technique for education.

The importance of improving and expanding the teaching of modern languages in Europe was one of the subjects included in the eight-point programme of the Consultative Assembly mentioned in the preceding chapter. The signatories of the European Cultural Convention pledged themselves to promote the teaching of their own languages and those of their fellow-signatories. Language teaching also formed the subject of resolutions adopted at the second and third conferences of the European Ministers of Education.

In 1963 the CCC, recognising that modern language teaching was an interest of more than one of its committees, decided to make of this subject one of its main concerns, and to launch a "combined operation" with the aim of furthering the expansion and improvement of modern language teaching as far as resources would permit. A number of international courses or meetings of experts resulted from this combined operation. In 1964 the CCC decided to re-name this combined operation, and to invite a group of three specialists to co-ordinate its new "Major Project: Modern Languages". The three specialists were kept hard at work, for as far as possible one or another of them attended each of the numerous international courses or meetings of experts which studied various aspects of the problem.

The dissemination of the more important of the results of these collective discussions was at first achieved by the publication, between 1963 and 1965, of four titles in the CCC's series "Education in Europe". Then in 1965 the formation of the International Association of Publishers for the Development of Applied Linguistics provided the CCC with an interesting opportunity. This new association, usually known as AIDELA, from the initial letters of its French title, was composed of a group of educational publishers from many countries, mostly, but not all, European. AIDELA concluded a contract with the Council of Europe for the publication (in both English and French) of the books resulting from the CCC's "Major Project: Modern Languages". These were in future to appear in a new series under the heading "Modern Languages in Europe". They were to be distributed by the chain of publishers of which AIDELA was composed.

In 1967 the report of the three co-ordinators was published in the series "Modern Languages in Europe" under the title *Modern Languages and the World of Today*. The CCC was now able to take stock of the progress of its Major Project. By September 1968 it was able to adopt a framework plan for modern language teaching, stretching over two decades and covering all educational fields. Later in the same month the Consultative Assembly adopted a recommendation which entirely supported the views of the CCC. And in January 1969 the Committee of Ministers converted the framework plan into an "intensified modern language teaching programme for Europe".

The most backward nations in Europe in respect of modern language teaching are those whose languages are most widely spoken in other countries. There are other European countries where children are expected to leave school with a really usable knowledge of at least one foreign language. The result of the CCC's activity has been that the expertise developed in the advanced countries has become known and available to all. There is no reason why the highest standards of achievement in the mastery of foreign languages should not in a foreseeable future be attained by children throughout the schools of the member states of the CCC. If the Council of Europe's ambitious "intensified modern language teaching programme for Europe" is successfully completed, these member states will thereby have succeeded in removing many of the language barriers which still hamper full communication between the peoples of Europe.

Notes to Chapter XI

1. For a short history of the Conference of European Ministers of Education, see the author's article "The Conference of European Ministers of Education" in Vol. XVIII of **The European Yearbook** (The Hague, Nijhof, 1970). The interaction of the conference and the CCC forms the theme of the author's book **A Ministry of Education for Europe** (London, Harrap, 1970),

Texts are quoted from Haigh: **Council of Europe.**

XII.

EUROPE TWENTY YEARS AHEAD

1. We noted in Chapter IX that the cultural mission of the Council of Europe was originally seen by the Consultative Assembly as a contribution to the political purpose of promoting a greater unity among the member states. Then the Administrative Board of the Cultural Fund made a change of emphasis in the programme; with the creation of the CCC, described in the preceding chapter, educational and cultural co-operation between member governments for the benefit of all had been accepted by the Committee of Ministers as the CCC's *raison d'etre*. The development has been described, in CCC documents, as a change from the *cultural approach* to the *technical co-operation approach*. This in turn has since been replaced by the *forward-looking approach*.

The starting-point of this new approach was the year 1966, when a new element was introduced into the overall planning of the Council of Europe's many separate programmes. The Committee of Ministers decided to adopt an annual Programme of Work, which would incorporate the programme of the CCC. In the Programme of Work of the Council of Europe, one chapter was devoted to education and another to culture (in addition, of course, to those devoted to the other aspects of the Council of Europe's diverse activities). Each chapter was headed by an exposition of the aims inspiring that sector of the work.

The aims of the educational programme were set out as follows:

> To assist governments to adjust their educational systems and methods so as to fit their citizens for the Europe of twenty years hence, especially through mutual aid, comparative surveys, the pooling of experience and the co-operative organisation of research; to create conditions permitting the progressive achievement of a real equivalence of curricula, examinations and qualifications and allowing of the free movement of students, academic staff and educational material; to contribute to the provision in member states, if need be on a joint European basis, of adequate facilities for scientific and technological research.

The cultural programme was described as being planned for the following purpose:

> To preserve and develop Europe's cultural heritage, having regard to its diversity and to the specific contribution of each country, and to promote access to an appreciation of it; to make people aware of their responsibilities as Europeans; to help to extend the new educational opportunities now open to young Europeans after leaving school and to sponsor the pursuit of and the provision of suitable facilities for physical activities and sport, especially through mutual aid, comparative surveys and the pooling of experience; to encourage the creative use of leisure in a civilisation where it is becoming increasingly widespread.

These two chapter-headings reflect the self-examination which the CCC began in June 1966, when it discovered that – partly on its own initiative, partly in response to the resolutions of the Ministers of Education, partly on the promptings of the Consultative Assembly – it was trying to undertake work in excess of its capacities in money and manpower. It now recognised that it must either persuade the Committee of Ministers to increase its resources still further (they had been growing year by year, but not as fast as the work), or else bring its activities into line with its resources. Having been advised that it could not hope to obtain the additional resources needed to match its ambitions, the CCC sadly decided to undertake an exercise of concentration.

This exercise was finalised in June 1967, when the CCC adopted a recommendation, which was duly approved by the Committee of Ministers, resulting in the abolition of the Technical Committee for Film Activities and the incorporation of all audio-visual and some cultural activities in the programmes of the other three permanent committees; to the regrouping of the educational programme under two heads: formal education and non-formal education; and to a reorganisation of the Directorate of Education and of Cultural and Scientific Affairs to take account of these changes.

From now onwards the CCC's internal programme was to become fused into a consistent whole; this whole must itself be logically relevant to the overall Programme of Work of the Council of Europe. The CCC's energies were to be consciously directed towards working within a single framework, defined by two guiding principles. The road along which it was to make its journey would be that of "Permanent Education", a process beginning before school, passing through the years of formal education at school and in the university or other institution at the higher level, and continuing thereafter throughout life. The headlights of the car in which the CCC was to travel were to be focused on "Europe Twenty Years Ahead". It was to be the CCC's aim so to conduct its activities that what it was doing at any given time would be seen to be producing its effect within twenty years' time. Moreover it was necessary not only to consider the educational problems of today, but to try to foresee what Europe's educational problems were likely to be in twenty years' time. Hence the designation of this new attitude to the CCC's work as the *forward-looking approach*. The CCC's efforts along these lines were spurred on by a recommendation of the Consultative Assembly "to rethink European cultural co-operation along constantly forward-looking lines and in terms of major targets whose attainment would signify a real cultural renaissance of Europe as an entity".

The problem was to reshape a programme which had grown up by a bringing together of the programmes developed independently by the CCC's permanent committees and only slightly modified by the CCC itself. Now the objective is to plan and carry out a single combined programme of the CCC, in harmony with the overall ministerial programme of the Council of Europe, of which it must form an harmonious part. To achieve this, close co-operation has had to be brought about among the three permanent committees, which must now devise the elements, each within its own field, of a CCC programme with a consistent and recognisable aim. This aim was to help decision-makers, by the pooling of experience, to improve education in the member countries and ensure that the educational systems should move towards greater harmonisation, taking into account the educational and cultural needs of man in a European society, in particular the need for future citizens to be suitably prepared to face and master the problems of an age of rapid change.

2. The experience gained by means of the "Major Project: Modern Languages", had shown that it was possible, when a single aim had been clearly defined by the CCC, so to co-ordinate programme items as to achieve mutually-reinforcing contributions to this single aim. Guided by the concept of permanent education, the CCC is now able to require from its three committees co-ordinated contributions to this concept in a number of forms. A simple example is pupil — teacher relationships. These will naturally follow a different pattern in school, in the university or other institute of higher education, and in the immense (and increasingly important) sphere of out-of-school education. The modern approach to these relationships can be summed up in the word "participation". Lessons in participation learned in the out-of-school sphere can perhaps be adapted for use in the sphere of higher education, and perhaps even (with considerable modification) in the school itself. Then again, all three committees are concerned with curricula, and with methods and techniques of training teachers, even if the teachers have to be trained for a wide spectrum of tasks, with each committee concerning itself with only a part of the spectrum. And throughout the spectrum, initial training is no longer enough: training has to be repeated and renewed.

The Committee for Higher Education and Research and the Committee for General and Technical Education are being asked to look at a number of subjects in which they have, if not similar interests, at least interests which are complementary. An example is provided by examinations, or other forms of testing the ability and performance of pupils. The diversification of post-secondary education, to which the former committee (encouraged by the decision of the Ministers of Education to consider post-secondary education in the context of life-long education at their conference in 1971) turned its attention, is paralleled by the consideration given by the latter committee to upper secondary education. And another theme of the Ministers of Education, access to higher education, has been looked at by the former committee from above, and by the latter committee from below.

A recommendation adopted by the Consultative Assembly in 1968 on the present crisis in European society caused the Committee for Higher Education and Research to identify certain topics of special importance to which it was already giving attention, but which would now be looked at in the light of the concept of permanent education. The education of teachers for all phases of permanent education was seen to furnish the universities with special responsibilities.

Once the CCC had adopted its forward-looking approach, the Committee for Higher Education and Research undertook to make analytical studies of its own role in research co-operation and of the university in Europe in the perspective of the next twenty years. Early in 1970 the committee convened a Round Table which noted that in all member states of the CCC post-secondary education was confronted with pressing problems of growth, arising from the massive influx of students into higher education combined with the changing demands of society for trained or retrained manpower. Diversification aimed at making the whole post-secondary education system more flexible and more responsive to present and future needs. While involving the creation of new institutions as well as the reform of those already existing, so as to offer a wide range of fields and patterns of study, diversification also aimed at maintaining and reinforcing the unity of the higher education system as a whole. The theme of diversification comprises also the participation of students in the management of institutions of higher education. It represents the most striking involvement of the committee in the general process of socio-cultural reappraisal of European society, and its most noteworthy contribution to the new forward-looking approach of the CCC.

The Committee for General and Technical Education has all along concentrated on the problems of the present and the short-term future, but is now looking to a longer-term future as well. During its first five years, the committee selected areas of useful and desirable co-operation; and carried out a number of fundamental studies, including an analysis of the means at its disposal. During this first phase, it placed particular emphasis on the promotion of modern language teaching, and on the improvement of the teaching of history, geography and civics.

A second five-year period was completed at the end of 1971. Modern languages and civics continued to be priority sectors; but the committee concentrated particularly on the problems of upper secondary education. The principal subjects of this phase of the committee's programme were technical and vocational education, examinations and teacher training.

Now the committee is engaged in thinking out a medium-term and a long-term programme intended to give weight to the impact of permanent education and new educational technology on education. The third five-year period, which began in 1972, is likely to see a concentration on pre-primary, primary and lower secondary education and the development of creative activity in schools. By focusing its attention on pre-primary and primary education, the committee is responding to a wish expressed by the European Ministers of Education at their conference held at Versailles in 1969, and is accepting responsibility for that phase of permanent education which begins before primary schooling takes over. January 1972 saw the holding of an important symposium on "The school and permanent education – Factors in primary and secondary education which determine the effectiveness of further education in after-life".

The committee is fully aware that traditional methods of teaching have got to accommodate themselves to new educational technologies – the language laboratory, the 8 mm film loop, closed-circuit television, programmed learning. The teachers must learn to dominate these technologies and not be overwhelmed by them. That is one of the challenges to which the Committee for General and Technical Education must now find the proper responses.

Clearly however the committee most affected – and most advantageously affected – by the new forward-looking approach of the CCC has been that for out-of-school education. Re-named the "Committee for Out-of-School Education and Cultural Development", it has taken on a new character, or rather it has at last found the character towards which it had hitherto been only feeling its way. Whereas the CCC and all its three committees are now concerned with what is described, in the new model of the Programme of Work of the Council of Europe, as "the cultural advancement and permanent education of man", there is a differentiation between the role of the first two committees and the third. The Committee for Higher Education and Research and the Committee for General and Technical Education, by reason of the composition of the existing national structures on which they depend, are geared rather to short and medium-term improvements. The Committee for Out-of-School Education and Cultural

Development, on the other hand, does not rest upon any such standardised national structures. It naturally therefore becomes the committee with the long-term forward-looking interdisciplinary approach. Socio-cultural development has been added to its responsibilities, and so has educational technology. Not that the other two committees are debarred from including specific cultural items in educational programmes which demand such inclusion: and the use of audio-visual media (or educational technology) is a normal part of their activities also. Thus the use of closed-circuit television has been studied by the Committee for Higher Education and Research as a technique of university teaching; and the Committee for General and Technical Education has maintained the co-production of educational films pioneered by the now defunct Technical Committee for Film Activities. But "research and development" into new ideas and new technologies has become an essential part of the third committee's programme.

In this context, the Committee for Out-of-School Education and Cultural Development has conducted a systematic survey of theory and practice in the field of adult education in a changing Europe. It has also undertaken a study of combined teaching systems comprising such elements as television, radio, correspondence courses, programmed instruction and face-to-face teaching. It has furthermore set out to discover what practical educational measures, and possibly political measures, would encourage the participation of the younger generation in community life.

Some of the activities on which the Committee for Out-of-School Education and Cultural Development is now focusing its attention, particularly those concerned with the participation of the younger generation in community life, have for a considerable time engaged the interest of the Consultative Assembly. The Assembly has pressed the Committee of Ministers to create a European Youth Foundation, in addition to its new European Youth Centre. Plans for the creation of such a European Youth Foundation had been put before the CCC by the Federal German Government. In December 1971 the Committee of Ministers unanimously took a decision of principle to create a European Youth Foundation. In the meantime it is clear that the CCC's work in building up the European Youth Centre has provided the Council of Europe with a politically important educational instrument which can interest organised youth in Europe in many aspects of permanent education.

3. The CCC is at present the only institutionalised organisation wholly devoted to educational and cultural co-operation among the twenty-one governments linked by the European Cultural Convention.[1] The Conference of European Ministers of Education comprises the same membership, but is not institutionalised: it has on occasion

invited OECD to carry out work on its behalf, but in practice the CCC acts as the principal executive organ of the conference. Though there is no formal link between the conference and the CCC, the Secretary General of the Council of Europe furnishes the conference with a secretariat, which is drawn in its major part from the Directorate of Education and of Cultural and Scientific Affairs, which services the CCC and its committees.

Nearly all the members of the CCC are also members of OECD, an organisation which extends geographically beyond Europe (its membership includes the USA, Canada and Japan). The Scientific Directorate of OECD is concerned with investment in education and with scientific policy (it provides the secretariat for a Conference of Ministers of Science). A recently-created offshoot of OECD, the Centre for Educational Research and Innovation (CERI), has extended its parent organisation's interest from the quantitative aspects of education to its qualitative aspects as well, which means that OECD now includes in its programmes educational matters that have long been the concern of the CCC.

Unesco covers the same ground as the CCC, but functioning as it does within a world-wide framework, it operates very differently from the CCC in spite of apparent similarities of programme. In recent years Unesco has organised European conferences of Ministers of Education, and plans to organise European conferences of Ministers of Science and of university rectors as well. Unesco's European regional conferences are however motivated by the political consideration of bringing Eastern and Western European countries together in technical fields, which is a different concept from that of technical co-operation which inspires the existing Conference of European Ministers of Education of the CCC member governments, the Conference of Ministers of Science of the Member Governments of OECD and the non-governmental Standing Conference of European University Rectors.

At the time when the CCC was brought into existence, there was a movement going on within the European Communities to organise an institutionalised form of educational and cultural co-operation among the six member governments, all of which are also signatories of the European Cultural Convention. This movement was brought to a halt in 1963. In 1971, when negotiations were resumed for the accession of additional European governments to the existing Six, a renewed attempt was made to institutionalise educational and cultural co-operation within the European Communities. Since the present six member governments of the European Communities, and such additional governments as are expected to join the Communities in January 1973, have since 1962 been practising educational and cultural co-operation in the CCC, there seems a likelihood that some of the activities which are being carried out among the member states of the CCC will before long be duplicated, with greater intensity and in greater depth, among about half that number of Cultural Convention countries.

There is, it is true, regular close contact between the Directorate of Education and of Cultural and Scientific Affairs of the Council of Europe and the secretariats of these other organisations. But, as was indicated in Chapter IX, the officials who represent their governments in the various organisations are generally not the same officials, and very often they are insufficiently briefed on their government's activities and policy in the other organisations. There is room for improvement in internal governmental co-ordination; without this, some element of duplication in the programmes of international organisations cannot be avoided. Hitherto this duplication has been more apparent than real; for even if two (or even more) international organisations are investigating what appears to be the same subject, they each look at it from a point of view which is consonant with the mandate and membership of the organisation, and no two international organisations have both the same membership and the same mandate. If however the European Communities, who are working for European integration, now create an institution for educational and cultural co-operation of their own, there is likely to be considerable duplication with the cultural mission of the Council of Europe, which is being carried out "to achieve greater unity between its Members".

There are numerous non-governmental organisations active in matters bearing on the programme of the CCC. When it first came into existence, the CCC maintained – for a very short while – the practice of the Administrative Board of the Cultural Fund of giving grants for specific projects to a selection of the bodies which made application for such grants. Soon the CCC found it prudent to leave both the collection and the distribution of private funds to the European Cultural Foundation: the "Arrangement" concluded between the Fund and the Foundation in 1960 was replaced in 1965 by a new Arrangement which spelt out the division of functions between the non-governmental and the intergovernmental body, while strengthening the machinery of co-operation between them.

The CCC does, however, co-operate closely with a number of non-governmental organisations operating in the field either of education or of youth matters. Sometimes it has commissioned a non-governmental organisation to carry out a part of its programme in return for a financial contribution. In the new phase of a forward-looking approach, the CCC is making greater use of its close links with non-governmental bodies in an attempt to foresee the future trends within which a pattern of permanent education must be worked out. And in one instance – and only one – it directly subsidises the administrative costs of a non-governmental body, namely European Schools Day (mentioned in Chapter X), which has received the formal patronage of the Committee of Ministers.

We saw, at the beginning of this chapter, how the CCC decided in 1967 to adopt a forward-looking approach. In the report which had been submitted to it by a group of three of its members the new approach was defined as follows:

> The group strongly recommends that the whole programme should be grouped around a single, forward-looking theme, namely "Europe twenty years ahead", and that projects should be judged by their potential value as contributions to this theme. This means in effect that the CCC would become an essential organ for promoting the establishment of life-long integrated education throughout the member states in the next generation. It seems necessary that there should be a European body which can look beyond the outmoded divisions of primary, secondary, higher and continued education and bear constantly in mind that, in the fullest sense, the process of learning and adaptation from childhood to old age is an educational whole.

To try to discern the shape of Europe twenty years ahead is a speculative activity. There are nevertheless many speculators in the field. One of them is the CCC's non-governmental partner, the European Cultural Foundation, which has formulated a "Plan 2000". The first project in this attempt to look into a future at present nearly thirty years distant is devoted to education. "Plan 2000" has become a European undertaking in which the European Cultural Foundation enjoys the support of ten co-operating foundations, OECD, the European Communities and the CCC. The studies which have been prepared as part of its educational project cannot fail to help the CCC in its striving to foresee, and contribute to the pattern of, Europe twenty years ahead.

The Council of Europe is itself engaged in an exercise in futurology. And, within the framework of this exercise, the CCC is trying to identify and follow into the future a number of educational and cultural trends which are likely to affect its own work, and which its own work is in turn likely to affect.

4. From the preceding chapters it will have emerged that the CCC, created by the fusion of two exercises in educational and cultural co-operation, one within the Council of Europe itself, the other in Western European Union, is a living organism which has grown and adapted itself in response to diverse and conflicting pressures – from the Consultative Assembly, which started the process which led to its creation, and has constantly urged it to meet new political requirements; from the Conference of European Ministers of Education, which is always asking it to undertake new tasks intended to be of service to its member governments in the execution of their educational policies; and from its master, the Committee of Ministers of the Council of

Europe, which has provided it with the resources for expansion, but has required in return that it should moderate its ambitions and concentrate its activities by fixing priorities of which only the most urgent can be achieved.

In this chapter it has been stated that the CCC is at present the only institutionalised organisation wholly devoted to educational and cultural co-operation among the twenty-one governments linked by the European Cultural Convention. What will be the pattern of educational and cultural co-operation in Europe twenty years ahead?

To give a meaningful answer to this question it would be necessary to have a foreknowledge of political developments in Europe in the next twenty years. Cultural development and, more insistently, educational development are gaining increasing attention from national governments in Europe. The experience of the CCC has shown that governments recognise the advantage, for their own national progress in these fields, of co-operation with other governments. It is natural to suppose that such co-operation would tend to follow the pattern of organised political co-operation. The experience of the CCC has shown that this is largely, but not wholly, true.

Two elements of this experience deserve particular notice. One is the decision of seven member governments of the Council of Europe first to transfer from London, the seat of Western European Union, to Strasbourg, the seat of the Council of Europe, the co-ordinating point of their educational and cultural co-operation; and then, within two years, to discontinue such co-operation among seven governments alone, and to carry it out solely within the larger organisation. This was an important measure of rationalisation and of concentration. The second noteworthy element is that, through the instrumentality of the European Cultural Convention, the Council of Europe made it possible for European non-member countries to participate in its work of educational and cultural co-operation. This was a measure of extension, which has made it not only theoretically, but also practically, possible for the CCC to operate beyond the boundaries of the political organisation which is its parent.

The increasing tendency of OECD to pursue measures of educational co-operation which have for some time been carried out within the CCC may at first sight seem curious, when there is so large an overlapping of membership between the two collectivities of governments. Perhaps however this can be accounted for by the fact that OECD comprises certain governments which, not being European, are not eligible for membership of the CCC. This does not however apply to the European Communities, whose six original Members, and likewise its prospective new Members, are all signatories of the European Cultural Convention. If the European Communities decide to institutionalise educational co-operation among themselves and thereby duplicate a part, probably the greater part, of the educational work of the CCC, this will surely mean that they wish to cover ground which is too low on the CCC's list of priorities to receive attention at present; or that they wish to go more thoroughly into subjects which the CCC's resources only permit it to explore inadequately; or both. This consideration leads one to note that when OECD tackles a subject which is also on the programme of the CCC, it devotes to it resources in money and manpower which are far greater than those which the CCC can command.

If therefore the work of the CCC should come to be duplicated, or even superseded, by that of other international organisations, the reason is likely to be that the Committee of Ministers of the Council of Europe has not the will to make full use of the machinery for educational and cultural co-operation which it has itself created. This will exists among Ministers of Education: but though the Conference of European Ministers of Education invites the CCC to undertake an increasing load of work on its behalf, it has no control over the resources which the CCC is able to apply to this work.

There are inevitable contradictions in the functioning of an organisation which was created and is financed by a Committee of Ministers for Foreign Affairs, but works in a field which is mainly the responsibility of Ministers of Education. Only when it is formally and effectively recognised that the CCC exists to carry out the wishes of a collectivity of *governments,* not of particular ministries within those governments, will the resources placed at the CCC's disposal be made commensurate with the requirements of the governments for which it works.

The particular contradiction inherent in the financial control over an executive organ of educational and cultural co-operation being exercised by a Committee of Ministers for Foreign Affairs, when that executive organ is in practice working primarily in the interests of a Conference of European Ministers of Education, has been avoided by the Nordic countries. As we saw in Chapter VII, the top level of co-operation within the framework of the Nordic Cultural Agreement of 1971 is a Nordic Ministerial Council which "shall take such decisions as are required to implement the aims of the treaty"; is to "prepare and decide concerning budget proposals" which have to be submitted to the five governments; and when the money has been granted is to decide the final allocations. In the context of the Nordic Cultural Agreement the Ministerial Council is a Council of Ministers of Education and Cultural Affairs. Similarly, the European Communities have at their top level a Council of Ministers: this Council can be composed of whatever Ministers are responsible for the subject under discussion. Thus if the Communities should decide to institutionalise educational co-operation among themselves, it is reasonable to suppose that the decision-making power will rest with the Ministers of Education of the member governments.

5. The Consultative Assembly has shown itself fully aware of this contradiction, and fertile in suggestions for overcoming it. In the recommendation on "Twenty years of European cultural co-operation" which it adopted in 1969, the Assembly asked that the Committee of Ministers should give a permanent character to the Conference of European Ministers of Education, should set up a European Office of Education under the technical control of Ministers of Education, and should invite the CCC to give priority to preparing and implementing a long-term programme of cultural development and to creating the necessary structure.

In its reply the Committee of Ministers explained that the Conference of European Ministers of Education, which was an independent body, had decided to review its role and status when it next met in Brussels in 1971. Meanwhile the Assembly's proposal to create a European Office of Education had been referred to the CCC.

The seventh Conference of European Ministers of Education decided that it would maintain the autonomy of the conference, and not institutionalise its structure and status. It would however rename itself the Standing Conference of European Ministers of Education, and so emphasise its permanent character. Among its functions would be that of assisting the Council of Europe, Unesco, OECD and the European Communities by providing guidance for the furtherance and co-ordination of their educational activities concerning its geographical region. Its own Committee of Senior Officials was to be given greater continuity and a more active role. The conference was thus to remain unattached to any international organisation (except to the extent that it remained dependent for secretarial services upon the Council of Europe), but was to make greater efforts than in the past to influence their educational programmes.

In September 1971 the CCC expressed its opinion on the recommendation of the Consultative Assembly referred to it by the Committee of Ministers. In the light of the decisions of the seventh Conference of European Ministers of Education, which besides stressing the development of collaboration between the international organisations already active in the field of education in Europe foresaw important tasks for the CCC involving the promotion of new and intensified forms of co-operation between European countries, the CCC considered that it would be premature to establish a separate European Office of Education.

The Consultative Assembly was not satisfied. In October 1971 it reverted to the question, to which it thought urgency was imparted by the prospect that the European Communities might soon be expanded from six countries to ten. It once again urged the Committee of Ministers to invite the Conference of European Ministers of Education to exercise technical control over the CCC in respect of its educational programme, and hoped to see a Conference of European Ministers of Culture also use the CCC as its instrument. Meanwhile the Assembly urged that the CCC should, for an experimental period of five years, perform the functions of a European Office of Education.

Spurred on by the insistence of the Consultative Assembly, the CCC in March 1972 took a stage further the process of defining the functions of a European Office of Education, and decided that, in view of its structure and composition, it was itself in an excellent situation to act as the focus for educational co-operation between the countries covered by its membership and thus to assume progressively the tasks of the sort of European Office of Education desired by the Assembly. This would however entail a steady increase of resources, in both money and staff, over a period of years. The Secretariat was asked to spell out the requirements in detail.

At the time of writing (September 1972) it remains to be seen how far the Committee of Ministers of the Council of Europe is prepared to go along the path which the Consultative Assembly wishes it to tread — the path of giving the CCC sufficient resources to enable it to provide to the Ministers of Education of the governments linked by the European Cultural Convention all those centralised and coordinating services which they have come to desire. The Consultative Assembly seems to feel, and to fear, a likelihood that, unless these services are provided in full measure at Strasbourg, a substantial number of the member countries of the CCC will provide them in full measure at Brussels, within the enlarged European Communities. In such an event, it is to be supposed that the Members of the enlarged European Communities would be less inclined to exploit the CCC's potential, once they were themselves furnished with a duplicate of the CCC at Brussels capable of meeting more intensively the requirements in the field of educational co-operation of a smaller number of countries; and the Council of Europe would have lost its opportunity of providing for the member states of the CCC what could become a Ministry of Education for Europe. Compromise possibilities have been suggested, whereby special projects, financed separately by those governments only which are interested in them, would nevertheless be carried out within the framework of the CCC. In this context the "partial agreement" experience described in Chapter IX provides, if not an encouraging precedent, at least a relevant analogy.

In the context of the present study, however, what is important is not which European organisation is to provide what services of educational and cultural co-operation to its member governments: what is important is that so many European governments have worked their way out of the primitive phase of cultural diplomacy, namely cultural propaganda; through the phase of bilateral cultural co-operation which is still the most widely-practised aspect of cultural diplomacy; into the phase of collective cultural co-operation, wherein cultural diplomacy has found its finest manifestation. For this form of cultural diplomacy is practised by governments not for the purpose of gaining advantages at the expense of others. By learning as well as teaching, by pooling ideas, experiences and resources, governments have now learned that the practice of this form of cultural diplomacy is a method of obtaining benefit for the people of each participating country, to the collective advantage of all.

Notes to Chapter XII

1. Though the Members of the Council of Europe were reduced from eighteen to seventeen when the Greek Government withdrew in 1969, Greece continued to exercise its right as a signatory of the European Cultural Convention to participate in the work of the CCC. The accession to the convention of three European governments not Members of the Council of Europe — Spain (1957), the Holy See (1967) and Finland (1970) brings the membership of the CCC to twenty-one. The seventeen member states of the Council of Europe are: Austria, Belgium, Cyprus, Denmark, Federal German Republic, France, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Luxembourg, Malta, the Netherlands, Norway, Sweden, Switzerland, Turkey and the United Kingdom.

Texts are quoted from Haigh: **Council of Europe.**

INDEX

Aaland Islands, 139, 142
Adam, Sir Ronald, 123, 125, 129
Adenauer, Konrad, 104
Afghanistan, 78
AIDELA (International Association of Publishers for the Development of Applied Linguistics), 229
Algeria, 77
Alliance française, 29, 30, 34, 69, 71, 73, 74, 75, 78
Angremy, Annie, 11, 17, 37, 67, 83
Australia, 49, 120
Austria, Austro-Hungarian Empire, 31, 103, 123, 246

Baarghorn, Frederick C., 17, 34, 35, 37
Barker, Sir Ernest, 50
Basdevant, Jean, 83
Bauer, Dr, German Chancellor, 32
Bavaria, 31
Belgium, Belgian Government, 42, 43, 47, 49, 52, 54, 75, 94, 125, 157, 170, 171, 186, 193, 246
Beloff, Max, 201
Bevin, Ernest, 124
Bodelsen, Carl, 196-7
Bolivia, 124
Borch-Jacobsen, Niels, 13
Boucher, French *Député*, 30
Bourgeois, Léon, 81
Brazil, 125
Brentano, von, 108
British Council, 11, 12, 36, 41-42, 43-45, 46, 47-48, 108, 112, 119-131, 158, 199
Brussels Treaty, Brussels Treaty Organisation, 11, 13, 54, 82, 125, 137, 155-172, 175, 179, 181-83, 184, 185, 193, 199, 204, 215, 216, 225
Bulgaria, 124
Burma, 124
Butler, R. A. (Lord Butler), 47, 48, 49, 57, 59

Cals, Joseph, 185, 188
Cambridge Conference of Rectors and Vice-Chancellors, 171, 177, 178, 187, 189
CAME (Conference of Allied Ministers of Education), 48-62, 67, 81, 82, 159
Canada, 49, 75, 120, 239
Cassin, René, 48, 58, 59
CCC (Council for Cultural Co-operation), 11, 12, 13, 14, 137, 164, 167, 189, 203, 207, 210, 211-46
CENYC (Council of European National Youth Committees), 223
CERI (Centre for Educational Research and Innovation), 239
China, 35, 49, 57, 124
Churchill, Sir Winston, 104
"Civilisation of Western Europe and the School, The", 161, 172, 201
College of Europe, 203
Columbus, Christopher, 27
Conference of European Ministers of Education, 13, 49, 50, 111, 137, 167, 185, 188, 209-10, 217, 218, 219, 220, 221, 222, 223, 229, 230, 234, 236, 237, 238, 239, 241, 243-5
Conference of Ministers of Science, 239
Consultative Assembly (of the Council of Europe) 162, 183, 193-4, 196, 198, 199, 200, 202, 204, 205, 206, 213, 214, 216, 233, 234, 235, 236, 238, 241, 244-5
Cook, Captain, 27
Council of Europe, 11, 12-13, 17, 82, 90, 92, 95, 96, 104, 105, 107, 114, 125, 131, 137, 158, 159, 162, 167, 168, 171-2, 176, 180, 182-4, 185-187, 188, 189, 191-246
"Council of Europe Film Week", 225
Cultural Fund (of the Council of Europe), 13, 204-5, 207, 208-10, 213-15, 216, 226, 233, 240
Cultural Identity Card, 161, 162, 167, 202, 227
Curzon, Lord, 35, 36
Cyprus, 246
Czechoslovakia, Czechoslovak Government, 43, 47, 49, 52, 54, 123-5, 228

Dand, C. H., 172

Daniel, 159
Dante Alighieri Society, 30, 89
Denmark, 137, 138, 142, 149, 171, 193, 246
Descartes, 28
Diderot, 28
Dijon Conference of Rectors and Vice-Chancellors, 178-9, 187-8, 189
Documentation Centre for Education in Europe, 218-20,
Drogheda, Earl of, Drogheda Committee, 125-7, 129, 130
Duggan, Stephen, 56

Ecuador, 124
Eden, Sir Anthony (Lord Avon), 126
"Education in Europe", 220, 221, 222, 224, 226, 228, 229
EEC (European Economic Community), 33, 149, 186
Effectus civilis, 168, 169
EFTA (European Free Trade Association), 149
Egypt, 27, 29, 35, 79
Emge, Martinus, 12, 17, 101, 104, 111, 115
England, England and Wales, 31, 41, 49
Equivalence Conventions, 168, 196-7, 222
Ethiopia, 78, 124
EUDISED (European Documentation and Information System for Education), 219
"European Aspects", 202
"Europe and the Europeans", 201, 202
European Broadcasting Union, 228
European Civics Campaign, 220
European Communities, 130, 131, 193, 214, 220, 225, 239-40, 241, 242, 243-5
European Cultural Centre, 201, 220
European Cultural Convention, 13, 151, 153, 197, 198, 205, 209, 213, 214, 216, 224, 226, 229, 239, 242, 245, 246
European Cultural Foundation, 205-6, 213, 220, 240, 241
European Office of Education, 244-5
European Schools Day, 93, 207, 240
European Survey of Educational Research, 219
European Youth Centre, 224-5, 238
European Youth Foundation, 238

Faroes, 138, 142
Federal German Republic, 11, 12, 62, 79, 91, 93, 99-115, 119, 127, 157, 171, 183, 184, 186, 238, 246
Finland, 137, 138, 142, 149, 246
France, French Government, 11, 12, 28-32, 33, 36-7, 49, 52, 54, 56, 58, 62, 65-83, 87, 90-91, 92, 93, 101, 102, 103, 104, 106, 108, 112, 119, 125, 128, 157, 160, 170-1, 182, 184, 186, 193, 208, 209, 246
Frederick the Great, 29
Frey, Kurt, 111
Fulbright, Senator J. Williams, 58

Gasperi, Alcide De, 201
Gaulle, General de, 43, 46, 47, 75, 149
George VI, King, 131
German Democratic Republic, 102, 103
Germany, the German *Reich*, 30, 32–33, 35, 36, 51, 52, 87, 101, 157
Glaser, Professor, 56, 57
Goethe Institute, 33, 105, 107, 109, 113-14
Gori, Umberto, 12, 17, 90, 92, 95, 96, 97
Grävenitz, Kurtfritz von, 106
Greece, 49, 52, 78, 123, 125, 246
Gürster, Eugen, 106
Gutenberg, 92

Haigh, Anthony, 17, 172, 189, 210, 230, 246
Haiti, 75
Hallstein, Walter, 104, 105
Harrison, J. A., 172
Helsinki Agreement, see Nordic Co-operation Treaty
Hessen, 31
Heuss, Theodor, 104
Hill, Charles (Lord Hill), 127, 130
Hitler, 35, 103
Holy See, The, 246
Homer, 27
Hoste, Jules, 51, 52, 54, 59, 159
Huguenots, 28
Hungary, 123, 124

IBE (International Bureau of Education), 47, 55, 57, 195, 219
Ibsen, Henrik, 138
Iceland, 124, 137, 138, 142, 149, 246
ICOM (International Council of Museums), 195
India, 35, 49, 124
Indonesia, 124
ILO (International Labour Office), 93
Institute of Intellectual Co-operation, 47, 52, 53, 55, 57, 58, 60, 61
Institute français, 31, 37, 43, 69, 77, 78, 79, 106
Iran, 78
Ireland, 193, 246

00221

Italy, Italian Government, 12, 30, 35, 36, 51, 52, 62, 78, 79, 85-97, 101, 102, 103, 105, 114, 119, 123, 125, 157, 171, 175, 183, 184, 186, 193, 201, 203, 246

Jacini, Count Stefano, 95
Japan, 122, 124, 239
Joulia, Pierre, 161, 172, 201
Joxe, Louis, 68, 194

Kefauver, Grayson, 56
Kogon, Professor, 201
Kuypers, Julien, 168, 169, 185

Laugier, Henri, 67, 68
Laurent, Pierre, 83
League of Nations, 47, 52, 53, 81
Lebanon, 78, 79
Lee, Muna, 17, 30, 37, 83, 131
Lessing, 92
Lloyd, Lord, 41, 129
Lorfstedt, Professor, 201
Luxembourg, Luxembourg Government, 43, 75, 125, 157, 170, 171, 180, 186, 193, 246
Lyche, Ingeborg, 13, 17, 153

MacLeish, Archibald, 50
"Major Project: Modern Languages", 229-30, 235
Malta, 228, 246
McLuhan, Marshall, 92
McMurry, Ruth Emily, 17, 30, 37, 83, 131
"Modern Languages in Europe", 229
Mojaev, G. A., 34
Moore, Henry, 125
Morocco, 77
Mussolini, 35
Myers, A. F., 56

Nantes, Revocation of the Edict of, 28
Napoleon, 27, 29, 31
NATO (North Atlantic Treaty Organisation), 13, 82, 96, 183, 193, 199
Nebuchadnezzar, 159
Netherlands, Netherlands Government, 42, 43, 49-50, 125, 157, 170-1, 180, 185, 186, 188, 193, 246
New Zealand, 49, 120
Niamey Conferences, 75
Noblemaire, French *Député*, 34
Nooten, S. I. van, 172
Norden, 137-8
Norden Associations, 13, 138-9, 141-3, 146-7, 152
Nordic Co-operation Treaty (Helsinki Agreement), 140-1, 142, 149-151, 157
Nordic Council, 140, 142-3, 147, 149-50, 151
Nordic Council of Ministers (Nordic Ministerial Council), 149-51, 152, 243
Nordic Cultural Agreement, 143, 145, 149-50, 151, 152, 153, 243
Nordic Cultural Commission, 13, 139-40, 141, 142-4, 145-6, 147-8, 150, 151-2, 199
Nordic Cultural Fund, 142-3, 144, 147-8, 153
Nordic Cultural Secretariat, 148, 152
Nordic Interparliamentary Union, 139
Nordic Ministers of Education, 139, 143, 146, 147, 148, 151, 243
Norway, Norwegian Government, 43, 49, 56, 125, 137, 138, 142, 149, 171, 193, 246
Norwegian Cultural Council, 12

Odysseus, 27, 28, 29
OECD (Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development), 13, 82, 96, 186, 214, 224, 239, 241, 242, 243, 244
OEEC (Organisation for European Economic Co-operation), 82, 186, 214
Open Window, The, 164–5, 179

Pakistan, 124
Paraguay, 124
Peter the Great, 28
Poland, Polish Government, 43, 47, 49, 52, 56, 103, 123, 124, 228
Polo, Marco, 28
Pompidou, President, 33
Portugal, 94, 123
Prince of Wales, 38
Prussia, 28, 30, 31, 33

Rabelais, 28
Reinink, H. T., 170, 171, 185, 200, 202-3
Rippon, Geoffrey, 130
Robertson, Sir Malcolm, 48, 122
Rougemont, Denis de, 201

Saar, the, 171, 203
Salat, Rudolf, 104, 105-6, 109, 115
Sattler, Dieter, 106, 108-10
Saxony, 31
Schuman, Robert, 201
Scotland, 31, 43
SEATO (South-East Asia Treaty Organisation), 82
Seymour, Richard, 11, 17, 62, 199
Simson, Otto von, 106
Sinker, Sir Paul, 129, 130
Slavik, Dr, 54-56, 57
Sommerfelt, Dr, 56
South Africa, 49
Spaak, Paul-Henri, 183

Spain, Spanish Government, 123, 198, 206, 246
Stalin, 35, 104
Standing Conference of European University Rectors and Vice-Chancellors, 187, 239
Statute of the Council of Europe, 193, 217
Sudan, 124
Sutherland, Graham, 125
Sweden, 137, 138, 142, 149, 171, 193, 246
Switzerland, Swiss Government, 75, 103, 124, 180, 246
Syria, 78

Thailand, 124
Toynbee, Arnold, 201
Treaty of Rome, 186, 214
Trützschler von Falkenstein, Heinz, 106, 108, 109
Tunisia, 77
Turkey, 123, 171, 246
Turner, Professor Ralph, 57, 58

Unesco (United Nations Educational Scientific and Cultural Organisation), 11, 12, 13-14, 34, 59, 60-62, 81, 82, 88-89, 90, 92, 93, 95-97, 104-6, 107, 113, 114, 125, 129, 169, 176, 179, 180, 183, 184, 185, 188, 195, 198, 199, 204, 214, 219, 224, 227, 239, 244
United Kingdom, Great Britain, United Kingdom Government, 12, 32, 33, 35, 36, 37, 42, 43, 47-49, 51, 52, 53, 59, 60, 62, 81, 87, 91, 101, 102, 104, 108, 117-31, 146, 157, 160, 170-1, 193, 203, 246
United Nations, 51, 58, 60-61, 75, 79, 125, 129, 157
United States of America, United States Government, 30, 33, 49, 57, 58, 60, 101, 103, 120, 129, 239
USSR, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Soviet Government, 34, 35, 49, 57, 102, 103, 127, 149, 228

Vaucher, Professor, 50, 51, 54, 56, 59
Veronese, Vittorino, 95
Versailles, Treaty of, 32, 33
Vichy Administration, 67
Vietnam, North, 78
Vinci, Leonardo da, 94
Voltaire, 28

Weimar Republic, 33, 35, 113
Werner, Bruno, 106
WEU (Western European Union), 13, 82, 125, 137, 157, 158, 159, 161, 163, 169, 171, 173-189, 193, 204, 208, 209, 213, 215, 216, 218, 223, 225, 241, 242,
White, A. J. S., 17, 37, 122, 127, 131
Wigny, Pierre, 186
Wilder, Thornton, 182
Wilhelmsen, Leif, 12
William I, German Emperor, 102
William IV, King of Prussia, 30

Yugoslavia, Yugoslav Government, 43, 49, 124, 228

SALES AGENTS FOR PUBLICATIONS OF THE COUNCIL OF EUROPE

AUSTRIA
Gerold & Co.
Graben 31
Vienna, 1

CANADA
Information Canada
Ottawa

DENMARK
Ejnar Munksgaard
Nörregade 6
Copenhagen

FEDERAL REPUBLIC
OF GERMANY
Verlag Dr. Hans Heger
Goethestraße 54, Postfach 821
D-53 Bonn-Bad Godesberg

GREECE
Librairie Kauffmann
28, rue Stadiou
Athens

ICELAND
Snaebjörn Jonsson & Co. A.F.
The English Bookshop
Hafnarstroeti 9
Reykjavik

IRELAND
Stationery Office
Dublin

ITALY
Libreria Commissionaria Sansoni
Via Lamarmora, 45
Casella Post 552
Florence

NETHERLANDS
N. V. Martinus Nijhoff
Lange Voorhout, 9
The Hague

NEW ZEALAND
Government Printing Office
20 Molesworth Street
Wellington

SPAIN
Libreria Mundi-Prensa
Castelló 37
E-Madrid 1

SWEDEN
Aktiebolaget C. E. Fritze
Kungl. Hovbokhandel
Fredsgatan 2
Stockholm

SWITZERLAND
Buchhandl. Hans Raunhardt
Kirchgasse 17
8000 Zürich 1

Librairie Payot
6, rue Grenus
1211 Geneva 11

TURKEY
Librairie Hachette
469, Istiklal Caddesi
Beyoglu
Istanbul

UNITED KINGDOM
H. M. Stationery Office
P. O. Box 569, London S. E. 1

UNITED STATES
Manhattan Publishing Company
225, Lafayette Street
New York, 10012 — N. Y.

STRASBOURG
Librairie Berger-Levrault
Place Broglie